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# Executive summary

## Brief description of project

The project document for “Standards and Labels for Promoting Energy Efficiency in Russia” (herein referred to as the Project) was signed on June 2010. The timeframe for project implementation is 2010-2014. The financing shall be provided in the form of Award accounting for USD 7,810,000. The Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation is to be the executing agency for this Project.

The Project commenced operations in April 2010 with the Project kick-off workshop. The Objective of the project is to reduce electricity consumption and, therefore, СО2 emissions due to the use of energy efficient products for community services, industrial and public buildings, and domestically. As per the past international experience, developing and implementing the energy efficiency labeling standards helps reduce significantly power consumption at minimum costs.

In order to reach this Objective 4 Outcomes were defined:

* 1. Outcome 1. Improve the national and regional legislation and regulatory environment and build up the institutional capacity to implement a comprehensive program for implementation and wide use of energy efficiency standards and labeling
	2. Outcome 2. Develop sets of standards for energy efficiency labeling and other regulatory documents, and public procurement models; establish the controlling and enforcement mechanisms, render assistance in developing the advanced systems and infrastructure for control over the respective execution and certification following the best international practice
	3. Outcome 3. Support for manufacturers and other supply chains agents; establish public-private partnerships; sign voluntary agreements; and have approved the joint strategies for improving energy efficient products competitiveness and their general availability
	4. Outcome 4. Raise awareness and provide access to information for the target group of equipment end users and purchasers, including household and commercial consumers

This report contains the main findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation (hereinafter: MTE) that was carried out of the project along the UNDP guidelines for outcome evaluation methodologies as provided in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results.

For the purposes of this report, the period of April 2010 until April 2013 will be taken into account.

## Context and purpose of the evaluation

### Context

The project started in May 2010 and is due to be completed in May 2015 and as of the total of 5 years for project implementation 3 years have already passed the overall results achieved up to date and the perspective for the remaining 2 years require evaluation.

### Purpose

The evaluation is being conducted to provide a comprehensive and systematic appraisal of the performance of the project by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including any agreed changes in the activities during project implementation which resulted from previous project evaluations. The purpose of the evaluation is to make recommendations to strengthen the project over the remaining 2 years and 40% of the project duration.

## Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Project Component or Objective
 | **Rating** |
| **Ratings of Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness\***(6 - Highly Satisfactory, 5 - Satisfactory, 4 - Marginally Satisfactory, 3 - Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2 - Unsatisfactory, 1 - Highly Unsatisfactory) |
| **Project Formulation** |
| **Overall Project Formulation (Relevance)** | 5 |
| 1. Conceptualization/design
 | 4 |
| 1. Stakeholder participation
 | 4 |
| **Project Implementation** |
| **Implementation Approach (Efficiency)** |  |
| 1. Use of the logical framework
 | 4 |
| 1. Adaptive management
 | 4 |
| 1. Use/establishment of information technologies
 | 4 |
| 1. Operational relationships between the institutions involved
 |  4 |
| 1. Technical capacities
 | 4 |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation** | 4 |
| **Stakeholder Participation** | 4 |
| 1. Production and dissemination of information
 | 4 |
| 1. Local resource users and NGOs participation
 | 4 |
| 1. Establishment of partnerships
 | 4 |
| 1. Involvement and support of governmental institutions
 | 4 |
| **Project Results** |
| **Overall Achievement of Objective and Outcomes (Effectiveness)** |  |
| 1. Objective
 | NA |
| 1. Outcome 1
 | 4 |
| 1. Outcome 2
 | 4 |
| 1. Outcome 3
 | 4 |
| 1. Outcome 4
 | 4 |
| **Sustainability Ratings\*\**** (4 - Likely, 3 - Moderately Likely, 2 - Moderately Unlikely, 1 - Unlikely)
 |
| **Sustainability** |  |
| 1. Financial sustainability
 | 4 |
| 1. Institutional sustainability
 | 3 |
| 1. Socio-economic sustainability
 | 3 |
| 1. Ecological sustainability
 | 3 |
| **Overall Project Achievement and Impact** | **4** |

### Main conclusions

The overall impression of the project is that the project rates as MS.

The project rates S in terms of:

* Financial administration
* Project administration
* Execution of task related to developing regulations, standards and legislation.

The project rates MS in terms of:

* Procurement procedures
* Effectiveness of execution of activities in terms of tangibility of results (for example training, awareness raising, PR have received attention during a very short time frame of the project, a clear design for a S&L scheme, a real internet resource, and so on.)
* Impact of activities and outputs
* Stakeholder involvement
* PR

The main areas of improvement:

1. The general idea and design of the project is Satisfactory. However, the formulation of project strategy and design as described in the project’s Prodoc and Logframe can be updated to the demands of today. The project strategy as described in the Logframe and as worked out in the different activities could benefit from improvement. The Objective and Outcomes can stay the same but the Outputs and Activities need a substantive revision. Moreover, project implementation (See comments to the logframe and examples further in this MTE). At the least the Project Manager should reformulate the project tasks in practical terms and agree that with UNDP country and Bratislava office. In several instances the Project Manager couldn’t explain what the meaning of certain outcomes, outputs and activities in the Logframe were. Fore example activity 1.3.3. mentions the “Establishment of a group of adherents to the EE S&L program of the Moscow municipality. Participants in this group will adopt a voluntary obligation to submit their products to EE testing and to exhibit an EE label in their products. The Project Manager mentioned that nobody understands what this activity means. MTE advises to clarify. (further examples provided further in this MTE).
2. The project can improve its reporting skills and practices. When the MTE asked simple questions like: “what is the project about” or “what are the main achievements of the project” or “what is the essence of outcome 2” the project team immediately refers to produced and filed documents. In order for the project to have a bigger effect the project team needs to focus more at presenting the essence and the successes of the project in a more concise, practical and attractive way. Many of the reports submitted for evaluation have no file names, no reference numbers, no Tables of Content, no summaries and so on. This should be improved in the future.
3. Relatively small size of the project team and weakness of the project management
	1. There is the overall attitude that the project team consists of the subcontractors as well. This is not correct. Most of the work is done by independent contractors. These contractors have other jobs and responsibilities and are not employed by the project. A clear distinction should be made between the actual project team and the individual contractors. With the project team consisting of a project manager, senior specialist and an assistant the team has no other option than to outsource most of the activities to independent contractors. These independent contractors cannot really be considered as part of the project team. All the contractors have other primary jobs, sources of income and responsibilities. Consequently there is little capacity building within the team and a resulting dependence of contractors. There is only one project team member doing some legal and technical work. Compared to other projects this is not much. The MTE gave no reason to assume that any of the contractors did not perform or did not work in good faith. Nevertheless, contractors have a singular focus at the particular task contracted and are less concerned with achieving the overall outcomes and the objective of the project. As a result, the project as a whole lacks consistence, coherence and substance. Project management should provide more leadership, vision and technical skills instead of a strong focus at procurement and formal fulfillment of requirements.
	2. The project management and project team consider that the overall project implementation is Satisfactory. The MTE has not been able to discern any proof of self-criticism by the project team or project manager neither has the MTE been provided with any information concerning areas in which the project team and project manager might improve. There is an aggressively defensive attitude towards any criticism. This would be a worrying sign in any organization.

* 1. Project management focuses at activities, outputs, outcomes and objective in this order. Ideally project management would focus first at the overall objective, then at the Outcomes and only after that at the outputs and activities. In the various interviews the interviewees have confirmed the impression that the project team focuses too much at procedures and formalities as a result of which a strong focus at concrete results. Many of the activities carried out and results have an ad-hoc character. One gets the impression that often the “bigger picture” of the project is forgotten and that project management gets lost in administrative details and individual tasks.
1. The project team and project management lacks communication, PR and networking capacities. A PR specialist has been contracted to work one day a week for the project and has been active since May 2013. The MTE has a positive impression of this PR specialist but questions whether one day a week is enough.
2. Procurement procedures are considered to be too cumbersome by project contractors and project management. The MTE advises to raise the ceiling of the amount up to which no tenders need to be held and to simplify procurement procedures in general.
3. Project Coherence is low. The project concerns equipment types that are subject to mandatory S&L and types that are subject to voluntary S&L. Mandatory and voluntary S&L schemes require different approaches. First of all the project needs to draft concise and clear action plans for both voluntary and mandatory equipment types (Plan M and Plan V). Plans M and V should describe what needs to be in place to fulfill Outcome 1 and the overall Objective of the project as stated in the logframe. Then Plans M and V should describe what the total of actions is that should be taken in general to fulfill the Outcome 1. After that Plans M and V should describe what interventions/actions out of this total of actions the project will engage in. After that the workplans should be made, the remaining budget should be contributed to the various activities and the actions should be fitted in the proper places in the logframe and agreed with the necessary bodies. This is what a normal basic constructive approach to the project should be instead of just simply focusing at individual project activities. Such an approach would also have the added benefit that the project team and project manager would have more success in communicating to the outside world what they are actually doing.

1. The project misses a strong lobbying function. When documents are submitted to the different institutions someone should lobby for those documents to be adopted. The MTE advises to strengthen the lobbying function of the project.

### Main achievements of the project after 3 years under implementation are:

1. It hasn’t been possible for this MTE to establish the amount of the reduction of GHG emissions as a result of a market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances resulting from the project’s interventions. The MTE hasn’t seen convincing documentary evidence. The MTE was informed that the project organized and held two works (research reports) through all the stages (ToR drafting, tender launch, selection, supervision of work, acceptance of results by working groups, etc.) to assess CO2 emissions reduction over the period 2009 – 2011. The CO2 emissions that were supposedly reduced in that period the project considers as its achievement. However, most of the legislative, training and PR/awareness raising work of the project was done in the second half of 2011 with the results having an impact at best towards the end of 2011. The MTE therefore poses the question to which the observed CO2 emissions reductions were actually a result of the project or simply a result of changing conditions in the market.

On the MTE’s question what project interventions actually caused an increase in the sales of EE equipment the following reply was given by the Project Manager:
“The Project is not supposed to sell refrigerators. The Project is oriented to create conditions and environment for promotion of EE products through various activities (legal framework, normative base, GOST standards, awareness raising, training, etc.). That is why this impossible to estimate How many EE refrigerators were bought as a result of the project's interventions. This task would be reasonable for a salesman who stands on a market place selling refrigerators.”

And this is exactly the point that the MTE raises. How can CO2 emission reduction be attributed to the project over the time period 2009-2011 when most of the project’s interventions such as work pertaining to legal framework, normative base, GOST standards, awareness raising, training, etc. was only carried out at best towards the second half and end of 2011?

1. The MTE could not come to the conclusion that an institutional, legal and regulatory basis has been established and that the capacity of the national authorities has been built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region. Documents have been prepared and submitted to the Moscow City Government and are under consideration. PM could not answer when the documents will be adopted. PM stated that this deliverable is supposed to be achieved by the end of the project. To MTE question how the S&L Scheme can be replicated to a second pilot region if it will only be established in the Moscow City by the end of the project no answer was given. Part of the selected equipment types are subject to mandatory S&L and part to voluntary S&L. MTE advises to set up different implementation plans for the voluntary and mandatory S&L schemes.
2. The NICB / Steering Committee was established but it is meeting only once per calendar year. (Output 1.1). Moreover, various parties taking part in the NICB are also subcontractors to the project and members of the Working Groups which may create governance problems.
3. The project was presented or represented at various seminars 9 times. 1 round table was organized, 1 seminar was organized and 1 meeting with press and experts was organized. There is room for improvement in this area. (Output 1.1)
4. Activity 1.1.4 mentions the “comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program”. On MTE question what this is exactly the PM answered: “I can only guess and do not know. It is a strange formulation. The Prodoc is not clear everywhere. It was written in 2008 and now we can only guess what the person had in mind”. MTE advises to clarify this.
5. Activity 1.1.5. mentions: “Ensure replication of EE S&L schemes in at least one additional pilot region beyond Moscow. Nizhny Novgorod region has been selected for replication. Following completion of initial piloting phase with the Moscow city Government additional regions for replication might be identified.” An agreement was signed with representatives of the Nizhniy Novgorod region for the inclusion of NN oblast in the project as a second pilot region. Apart from the agreement the MTE hasn’t been able to discern any effective actions.
6. Good results were achieved under Output 1.2. Various analyses of legal acts, proposals for amendments and draft legislation have been produced by the project.
7. Under Output 1.3 drafts of administrative acts have been developed but the MTE has not seen any indication of the acts being actually adopted by the Moscow City Government. Also the MTE has seen no results of the implementation – in consultation and cooperation with equipment manufacturers and other stakeholders – of the voluntary EE S&L program in the Moscow municipality, based on and in line with the EE S&L scheme developed under Output 2.1.
8. The MTE has seen no ready designed National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products. Neither has the MTE seen the emergence of a full cycle verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices.
9. Under Output 2.1 impressive results have been achieved where it concerns the development and adoption of testing and labeling standards. 5 standards have been developed and adopted in 2011. 3 standards have been developed in 2012 and are awaiting adoption and 2 more standards are planned to be developed in 2013.
10. Output 2.2 speaks of a system of compliance testing and certification. Some methods on compliance testing have been drafted. Some work with testing laboratories has been completed.
11. Output 2.3 describes the development of Procurement models for energy efficient equipment. Substantial work has been done towards fulfillment of this Output but the MTE hasn’t been able to discern any complete procurement models for all the selected equipment types.
12. The enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices may have been achieved but this important work requires continuous attention.
13. The Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising of Output 3.1 have almost solely received attention in the time period in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011. MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project.
14. The Working Groups of Output 3.2 have been established but it has been difficult to determine their concrete effect.
15. Output 3.3 prescribes that voluntary agreements on product labeling and incorporation of energy efficiency in the market strategy of manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders need to be signed. Two such agreements were signed.
16. Work was done towards the achievement of Output 3.4. It would be good to know to what extent the reports made by organizations such as Ratek, Insolar and Termek actually ended up being used by the manufacturers, distributors, developers and banks.
17. The level to which awareness was enhanced and to which access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances can be increased by having a proper Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising plan for the remainder of the project duration.
18. Output 4.1 defines the creation of a “Market monitoring mechanism” to produce updated information on the sales of the target appliances by energy classes. The MTE has not received information about the existence of such a mechanism.
19. The Internet-based information clearinghouse mentioned in Output 4.2 is at this moment a relatively simple website. [www.label-ee.ru](http://www.label-ee.ru). The MTE regards the website to have been established but it wouldn’t go as far as to label it an “information clearinghouse”. As a simple website the site [www.label-ee.ru](http://www.label-ee.ru) is just about passable.
20. Meaningful work was done towards Output 4.3 (Regional awareness campaign for household consumers) but the activities mainly took place during a 4 month period in 2011 and were largely focused at school kids. Much more work will need to be done to come to a satisfactory fulfillment of this Output.
21. Some activities have been carried out under Output 4.4 (Information campaign for large commercial buyers) but the effectiveness of the information campaign is still a question to the MTE and more work will need to be done to come to a satisfactory fulfillment of this Output..
22. Under Output 4.5 sales personnel for household appliances and technical building equipment should be trained. Some trainings have taken place but qualitative and quantitative data hasn’t been received by the MTE yet and effectiveness of the trainings is still a question.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item to be assessed | Achievements | Comments |
| Objective / Outcome / Output / Activity |  |  |
| Objective: The objective of the project is the reduction of GHG emissions by facilitating market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances. | Calculations have been submitted. | Calculations are based on research carried out over the period 2009-2011 whereas the project’s activities largely commenced in the second half of 2011. It is not proven to the MTE that CO2 emission reductions were achieved by facilitation by the project of market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances. MTE advises to carry out additional calculations covering the period 2011-2013.Mildly Satisfactory |
| Outcome 1: An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.  | Documents have been prepared and submitted to the Moscow City Government and are under consideration. The MTE hasn’t been able to discern whether the institutional, legal and regulatory basis has been established and whether the capacity of the national authorities to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing was built in at least one pilot region during the implementation of the project. | The project should differentiate between voluntary and mandatory schemes according to the different equipment types that the project deals with. This would greatly increase the clarity and transparency of the project. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Output 1.1: National interagency coordination body  | The NICB has been established. | MTE questions how effective the NICB can be if it meets only once a year. The MTE also advises to hold bi-annual meetings. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 1.1.1. Establish the National Interagency Coordination Body (NICB). | The NICB has been established and has met 4 times since the inception of the project. | Satisfactory |
| 1.1.2. Confirm the detailed agenda of the activities to be developed under the project, including the detailed work plan, seeking consensus among the members of the National Interagency Coordination Body. | The detailed agenda has been confirmed. | Satisfactory |
| 1.1.3. Organise seminars and round-tables for decision makers of ministries, government agencies, legislators and other policy makers. | The project was presented or represented at various seminars 8 times. 2 round tables were organized, 1 seminar was organized and 1 meeting with press and experts was organized. | The MTE considers that for a 3 year time period this is the minimal result that might have been expected. MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 1.1.4. Supervise the implementation of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program to track the progress and provide feedback for the improvement/adjustment of the EE S&L instruments implemented. Direct and indirect global environmental benefits (reduction of CO2 emissions) will be assessed and reported, under the overall responsibility of the NICB (see also output 4.1). | ZAO "SKM" sent a letter "Improving normative legal regulation in the field of infoware for events devoted to energy conservation and improving energy efficiency in the field of household equipment and engineering building equipment register formation and maintenance" for the year 2012 to the Ministry of Energy. OOO "GFK-Russia" "Monitoring of energy consumption and GHG emissions estimates for selected household equipment for 2009-2011". OOO "Ensis Technologies" made a report called "Monitoring of of energy consumption and GHG emissions estimates for selected engineering building equipment for 2009-2011"  | Work has doubtlessly been done under this activity but one cannot speak of a “Supervision of the implementation of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program to track the progress and the provision of feedback for the improvement/adjustment of the EE S&L instruments implemented.Two reports on GHG emissions reductions have been made but these seem to be general calculations of the hypothetic emissions reduction potential and not the emissions caused by the project as they refer to the period 2009-2011. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 1.1.5. Ensure replication of EE S&L schemes in at least one additional pilot region beyond Moscow. Nizhny Novgorod region has been selected for replication. Following completion of initial piloting phase with the Moscow city Government additional regions for replication might be identified.  | An agreement was signed with representatives of the Nizhniy Novgorod region for the inclusion of NN oblast in the project as a second pilot region. | Apart from the agreement the MTE hasn’t been able to discern any effective actions. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Output 1.2: Provisions for EE S&L under national law  |  | According to the project team 80% of the work under output 1.2 has been completed. The MTE has discerned that indeed considerable work was done under this output. For purposes of communication of project results and PR it would be good if a concise and clear overview was made of the project’s achievements in this field. Satisfactory  |
| 1.2.1. Prepare proposals for the amendment of the Federal Law on Technical Regulation, or pertinent Government resolutions (see output 2.1), in order to allow the adoption of mandatory energy efficiency labeling and minimum efficiency performance standards (MEPS) at the federal level. | Proposals and amendments were prepared, submitted and accepted for FZ#261. The following FZs have been ammended: "On technical regulations # 261-FZ of 23.11.2009," of 30.12.2009 N 384-FZ, of 30.12.2009 N 385-FZ, of 28.09.2010 N 243-FZ, of 21.07.2011 N 255-FZ, of 30.11.2011 N 347-FZ, of 06.12.2011 N 409-FZ,of 28.07.2012 N 133-FZ). Absence of necessity for amending FZ#184 "On technical regulation" has been justified. | Satisfactory |
| 1.2.2. Review the stipulations that concern EE S&L in the new “Law on Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement” and support development of the required secondary regulations. | Reviews were carried out and proposals for amendments were drafted. | Satisfactory |
| 1.2.3. Submit the legal proposals elaborated under activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 to the relevant federal ministries, to initiate the public discussion on the suggested amendments or regulations (involving interested ministries) and its submission to the State Duma and the Expert Committee for Technical Regulation of the Federal Government respectively. | The proposals were submitted. | Satisfactory. |
| Output 1.3: Adoption of the required administrative acts for the Moscow pilot region to implement the pilot program  |  | Drafts of administrative acts have been developed but the MTE has not seen any indication of the acts being actually adopted by the Moscow City Government. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 1.3.1. Adopt the required regulations for the Moscow pilot region to allow the implementation of a voluntary EE S&L scheme within the region, including the establishment of legal and administrative rules for such a program. | Regulations have been developed but no have been adopted yet. | This activity requires more attention during the remainder of the project. The project team should increase lobbying efforts vis a vis the Moscow City Government. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 1.3.2. Implement – in consultation and cooperation with equipment manufacturers and other stakeholders – a voluntary EE S&L program in the Moscow municipality (pilot region), based on and in line with the EE S&L scheme developed under Output 2.1. |  | The MTE has seen no results of the implementation – in consultation and cooperation with equipment manufacturers and other stakeholders – of the voluntary EE S&L program in the Moscow municipality, based on and in line with the EE S&L scheme developed under Output 2.1. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 1.3.3. Establish a group of adherents to the EE S&L program of the Moscow municipality. Participants in this group will adopt a voluntary obligation to submit their products to EE testing and to exhibit an EE label in their products. | No result. | The Project Manager mentioned that nobody understands what this activity means. MTE advises to clarify. Mildly Unsatisfactory |
| 1.3.4. Develop and implement EE labeling and minimum energy performance requirements for appliances and technical building equipment purchased under public procurement activities. | EE labeling and minimum energy performance requirements for appliances and technical building equipment purchased under public procurement activities were partially developed but the MTE has seen no signs of their implementation. | The activity states develop and implement. As far as the development is concerned work has been done (according to the project team 80%) but the part relating to implementation requires more attention. Satisfactory. |
| 1.3.5. Prepare a model for replicating local regulatory and public procurement schemes to other Russian regions and implement targeted replication in at least one region (Nizhny Novgorod region). | Agreement has been signed. | The MTE has not been able to clarify what exactly will be replicated as regulatory and public procurement schemes have not yet been implemented in the first pilot region. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Outcome 2: National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products are designed and proposed and the verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices built.  | The project has submitted a number of documents, standards, by laws and legislative acts. This Outcome is still under implementation. | The MTE has seen no indications of National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products having been designed and proposed. Neither has the MTE discerned the implementation of verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices. Mildly Satisfactory  |
| Output 2.1: Energy efficiency testing and labeling standards  | The results under this output are impressive where it concerns the development and adoption of testing and labeling standards. 5 standards have been developed and adopted in 2011. 3 standards have been developed in 2012 and are awaiting adoption and 2 more standards are planned to be developed in 2013.  | Satisfactory. |
| 2.1.1. Develop test procedures for the selected household appliances and technical building equipment/systems to be published as GOST-standards, following the usual procedures for the elaboration and publication of technical standards (as defined by the International Organization for Standardization). The proposed test procedures will be based on international, in particular ISO/IEC standards. | Proposals on elaboration of interstate standards possessing requirements to EE of household refrigerated equipment and household automative washing mashines were elaborated. "Elaboration of GOST R ""Energy efficiency. Glandless standalone circulators and glandless circulators integrated in products.Informing of consumers about energy efficiency of glandless circulators"". "Elaboration of GOST R "Energy Efficiency. Household refrigerated devices. Projecting taking into account environmental impact". Elaboration of GOST R "Energy Efficiency. Household wasing machines. Projecting taking into account environmental impact". | Satisfactory |
| 2.1.2. Continue and refine the market assessments realized in the preparatory phase of the project, with the objective to establish an order of priority and time frame for the inclusion of additional household and technical building equipment in the EE S&L program.  | The project team describes the results of this activity as: { Marketing studies to assess market condition (undertaken at a Project preparation stage), as well as to identify priority and terms for inclusion of additional kinds of household and building engineering equipment into the EE S&L Program.}  | The MTE could not form a clear picture about the actual work carried out under this activity because: 1. the project team talks about studies (undertaken at a project preparation stage) and 2. as verification sources the same two reports are mentioned as under outcome 1 (i.e. OOO "GFK-Russia" "Monitoring of energy consumption and GHG emissions estimates for selected household equipment for 2009-2011". OOO "Ensis Technologies" made a report called "Monitoring of of energy consumption and GHG emissions estimates for selected engineering building equipment for 2009-2011). Mildly Satisfactory |
| 2.1.3. Develop energy efficiency labels for the selected household appliances and technical building equipment. Label design will be based on surveys among consumers and manufacturers and take into consideration existing labeling schemes, including the EU-label for household appliances and labeling schemes proposed by European manufacturers for building equipment. All relevant stakeholders will be consulted in this process. | Labels for refrigerators and washing machines have been developed but they have not yet been approved. Labels for technical building equipment have not yet been developed. | Still considerable work needs to be done in this area. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 2.1.4. Develop official GOST-standards (new and revised) or equivalent normative documents for energy efficiency labeling of the selected household appliances and technical building equipment. | One GOST R standard was developed and adopted for household washing machines and analogous ones.  | If one standard is sufficient to fulfill this activity for the time being then the MTE has no further questions regarding this activity. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Output 2.2: System of compliance testing and certification  | See below | Important work has been done under this Output but the MTE hasn’t been able to discern an established “system” of compliance testing and certification. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 2.2.1. Implementing voluntary certification schemes for energy efficiency compliance testing, based on the test procedures (GOST-standards) prepared under activity 2.1.1, compatible with the federal system of compliance certification and registered by the Federal Agency for Technical Regulation and Metrology. The voluntary certification schemes shall be applied by associations of equipment manufacturers and suppliers, under the guidance of the Ministry of Education and Science. | A “methodics draft” on declaring product compliance to EE requirements and labeling product in accordance to indicators was elaborated. Methodics draft was submitted to Rosstandard for approval in 2011. The MTE has seen no proof of the voluntary certification schemes actually being applied by associations of equipment manufacturers and suppliers. | More focus needs to be given to the actual Implementation of the voluntary certification schemes. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 2.2.2. Reviewing certified test laboratories, in particular ROSTEST laboratories and manufacturers' own manufacturers, and proposing improvements, if necessary. | This has been done. | Satisfactory |
| 2.2.3. Supporting selected certified ROSTEST testing laboratories working with building engineering equipment and appliances; and establishing a test laboratory for household appliance efficiency by OJSC Mosenergosbyt. The laboratory of OJSC Mosenergosbyt will be accredited under the rules of the Federal Agency on Technical Regulation and Metrology, operate on a commercial basis (like ROSTEST laboratories) and focus on the pilot region (Moscow municipality).  | The project reports that an agreement on support actions for a test laboratory of OAO "KZH "Biryusa" (Krasnoyarsk) on equipping it with necessary for testing commercial refrigerated equipment units was reached. Rostest did not need any assistance and Mosenergosbyt did not wish to work with the project under this activity as it does not plan to establish a laboratory. | Some work was done under this activity but it seems diverted from the formulation of the original activity. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| Output 2.3: Procurement models for energy efficient equipment  |  | Substantial work has been done towards fulfillment of this Output but the MTE hasn’t been able to discern any complete procurement models for all the selected equipment types. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 2.3.1. Develop guidelines, including minimum energy performance standards, for the procurement of technical building equipment and systems (HVAC, industrial air conditioners and fans, pumps), following the technical standards developed under activity 2.1.1 and the energy efficiency labels developed under activity 2.1.3. | Leading principles for engineering building equipment procurement (including minimal EE requirements to engineering equipment, engineering systems, buildings and constructions) were elaborated. Materials were used by ZAO "SKM" when fulfilling work "Elaboration of legislative and other normative acts drafts of Moscow City, including Moscow Government and authorised Moscow executive bodies acts in the field of EE S&L application". Recommendations on placing orders for engineering building equipment and household equipment with regards to their energy efficiency. Materials were submitted to Moscow City Government. Technical guidance to EE labeling systems of buildings, constructions, including engineering systems and equipment was elaborated.  | There is a question with regard to the fact that activity 2.3.1 is supposed to be partly based on the output of activity 2.1.3. Activity 2.3.1 deals with technical building equipment whereas 2.1.3 is executed for household equipment. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| Outcome 3: Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.  | It is hard to assess how many and exactly which local manufacturers and other supply chain stakeholders have an enhanced interest to comply with the new EE standards and to bring EE models to the market at competitive and affordable prices. | The project should better communicate qualitative and quantitative information on the manufacturers and supply chain stakeholders that testify of an enhanced interest and strengthened capacity as a result of the project’s intervention. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Output 3.1: Awareness raising, training and technical support for local manufacturers on product and production technologies  |  | This entire output was executed in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011. The same documents are referred to as verification sources for the activities 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4 and 3.1.5. Although it is difficult now, two years later, to ascertain the quality and effect of output 3.1, the fact that awareness raising, training and TA was done in a 5 month time period instead of along the entire duration of the project raises some questions. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 3.1.1. Carry out a survey among manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment, in order to identify needs for training and technical assistance in energy efficiency product design. | Surveys were carried out in 2011. | The MTE advises to update the surveys as the relevance of the survey results 2 years later is low. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 3.1.2. Carry out a survey among manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment, in order to identify needs for technical assistance in the adaption of production facilities (in combination with activity 3.1.1). |
| 3.1.3. Organise training events and provide technical assistance to local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment, focusing on: energy efficient product design, technical standards, equipment testing and cost. Training events and technical assistance will include transfer of experiences with EE S&L programs by foreign and multi-national appliance and equipment manufacturers.  | Trainings were carried out. | Trainings were carried out in a 5 month time period in 2011. Ideally training would be an ongoing component of the project and not a one off event. MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project. |
| 3.1.4. Provide technical assistance to local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment with regard to the adaptation of their production facilities due to the production of new, energy efficient models. | Technical Assistance was provided judging by the reports. | TA was carried out in a 5 month time period in 2011. Ideally TA would be an ongoing component of the project and not a one off event. MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project. |
| 3.1.5. Provide technical assistance to local manufacturer with regard to the upgrading of their test laboratories, as necessary. | Technical Assistance was provided judging by the reports. | MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project. |
| Output 3.2: Working group to elaborate public-private partnerships  | No result discovered by the MTE. | PM states that the term PPP is not relevant for this project. PM considers that the WGs and the NICB can be considered as PPPs. Mildly Unsatisfactory |
| 3.2.1. Establish a formal structure of communication and cooperation (working group), including the mentioned private sector participants, the entity in charge of managing the project (Ministry of Education and Science), selected members of the Inter-agency Coordination Body, the "group of adherence" to the program, the Moscow city government and OJSC Mosenergosbyt, and other interested local governments. | Three Working Groups have been created: 1) Technical projecting and analysis of standards and labels schemes, tests for compliance and project implementation; 2) Working Group on normative base development and Moscow pilot program’s implementation; 3) Working Group on strengthening “supply” link in supply chain, marketing and population’s awareness rising.  | The MTE has questions about the effective work carried out by the Working Groups as based upon the current information available the working groups seem to have a largely formal and ceremonial function. From the project website it becomes clear that WGs have only met twice in 2011. Mildly Unsatisfactory |
| 3.2.2. Elaborate and set up public-private partnerships to promote the adoption of schemes to promote EE S&L and marketing and sales of energy efficient appliances and equipment.  | As a result of this activity the project team wrote: “Participation in the Steering Committee meeting of the EBRD project "Energy Efficient Equipment in Russia"”. | This is not a satisfactory result. Moreover, the most recent participation of the project team in the last Steering Committee meeting of the EBRD project led to complaints about aggressive and dominant behavior of the UNDP project team member present. Unsatisfactory |
| Output 3.3: Voluntary agreements on product labeling and incorporation of energy efficiency in the market strategy of manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders  | Two agreements were signed. | Some work has been done in the direction of this output but the lion share of the work still seems to lie ahead of the project team. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 3.3.1. Negotiate with manufactures and distributors of household appliances and technical building equipment voluntary agreements for equipment labeling at sales points and inclusion of energy efficiency information in product documentation. | Agreements have been signed with two domestic producers. | If two agreements are deemed to be sufficient result then the MTE has no further questions regarding this activity. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 3.3.2. Develop – in cooperation with manufactures, distributors and large commercial buyers of technical building equipment – guidelines for a system of energy efficiency indicators for new buildings, based on the energy efficiency of building construction and the technical systems covered by this project. | Guidelines for a system of energy efficiency indicators for new buildings, based on the energy efficiency of building construction and the technical systems covered by this project were elaborated. Elaborated materials were submitted to the Ministry of regional development of Russia. Materials were used by the Ministry of regional development when preparation of orders.  | Standards of associations (AVOK) on labeling engineering and building equipment is going to be elaborated in 2013. The project implementation table mentions: “Developed technical guidance for a system of energy efficiency of buildings and constructions, including engineering systems and equipment. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| Output 3.4: Public-private partnerships and joint strategies to make energy efficient products more competitive and affordable to the majority of the population  | No PPPs were formed. | PM states that the term PPP is not relevant for this project. PM considers that the WGs and the NICB can be considered as PPPs. Mildly Unsatisfactory |
| 3.4.1. Discuss with both local and foreign manufacturers and distributors of household appliances possible product pricing strategies that encourage the purchase of energy efficient equipment by low and middle income consumers. | The project mentions that possible versions of a price strategy stimulating consumers with a low and average income to purchase EE devices were developed and that the strategy was discussed with Russian and foreign manufacturers and distributors of household equipment. | Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 3.4.2. Assist local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment in the elaboration of business plans and marketing strategies for production and marketing of energy efficient products. | As a result of this activity the project team wrote: “Participation in the Steering Committee meeting of the EBRD project "Energy Efficient Equipment in Russia"”.The project mentions the development of two business plans and marketing strategy elaboration methods and business plan draft for manufacturing of EE household equipment and engineering building equipment, business plan and marketing strategy for a pilot region were elaborated. | This is not a satisfactory result. Moreover, the most recent participation of the project team in the last Steering Committee meeting of the EBRD project led to complaints about aggressive and dominant behavior of the UNDP project team member present. Unsatisfactory.After requests the MTE did not receive this business plans (dd 24.07.2013). MTE couldn’t find them on the CD with the project documentation. Apparently they are developed in the same period of in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011 and are verified by the same Ratek and Insolar reports. It turns out that the period of in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011 was one of the most productive periods of the project.The MTE also didn’t receive information about the extent to which extent the local manufacturers and distributors received actual assistance going beyond the elaboration of a generic business plan (dd 24.07.2013). Unsatisfactory |
| 3.4.3. Assist local manufacturers and distributors of household appliances and technical building equipment in the preparation of promotional materials (folders, advertisements, TV-spots, etc.) for energy efficient products, as well as promotional events, e.g. at sales outlets. | Proposals on eliminating barriers for increasing sales of EE equipment. Proposals on increasing sales of EE products mechanisms, including consumer credits and improving interest of manufacturers were elaborated. Specific proposals on promotion of EE equipment by means of advertisement (advertizing campaign strategy, recommendations on advertisement materials elaboration, examples of ToRs on advertisement b-rolls). Elaborated materials were tested during a sample PR action in a Moscow Trade Mall. Materials were published in magazines "Remont i service electronnoy techniki" and "Pokupaem ot A do Ya".Also PR actions in 8 malls were held. | Again the lion share of the work in this activity was done in the period of in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011. The MTE did not see the, advertisements, TV-spots, etc. (dd 24.07.2013) MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 3.4.4. Develop a system of preferential consumer credits (based on the existing consumer credit systems) for energy efficient appliances, in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders, including manufacturers and distributors of appliances and finance institutes. | Recommendations were done. | MTE suggests to increase efforts concerning the practical implementation of the recommendations as mentioned in the project implementation table. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 3.4.5. Develop a system of incentives for large commercial buyers, including the use of "Economic development electricity tariffs (EDET)". | Proposals and system were developed. | Also this happened in the period of in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 3.4.6. Preparation of corporate procurement programs with project developers / general contractors for construction projects (residential and commercial buildings), using certified and labeled technical building equipment. | Corporate purchase programs reflecting significance of energy efficiency criteria and cost-effectiveness when selecting engineering building equipment were developed.  | The MTE by 24.07.2013 did not receive information about which project developers / general contractors for construction projects (residential and commercial buildings), are using certified and labeled technical building equipment while applying the corporate procurement programs. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances  | Work has been done towards fulfillment of this outcome. | The MTE is currently of the opinion that the lion share of work towards fulfillment of this outcome still needs to be done. MTE suggests the drafting of a program for Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising for the remaining duration of the project. Mildly Satisfactory |
| Output 4.1: Market monitoring mechanism to produce updated information on the sales of the target appliances by energy classes.  | The MTE has not been able to identify a functioning market monitoring mechanism or the start of the creation of one. | The MTE by 24.07.2013 did not receive additional information on this item. Who is supposed to be the owner of this mechanism? Mildly Unsatisfactory. |
| 4.1.1. Finalize the strategy and required software for obtaining, storing and processing the required data at the adequate level of details, including at minimum, the annual sale of different appliances by energy classes and different product categories and sources of origin (local – imported).  | Part of the results mentioned under this activity are formulated as: “Marketing studies to assess market condition (undertaken at a Project preparation stage), as well as to identify priority and terms for inclusion of additional kinds of household and building engineering equipment into the EE S&L Program.”  | We already came across the exact same reports in 2.1.2 and under Outcome 1 (i.e. OOO "GFK-Russia" "Monitoring of energy consumption and GHG emissions estimates for selected household equipment for 2009-2011". OOO "Ensis Technologies" made a report called "Monitoring of of energy consumption and GHG emissions estimates for selected engineering building equipment for 2009-2011).This means that work is done in 2013 based upon reports focusing at the period 2009-2011. Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.1.2. Conclude agreements with the key private and public sector stakeholders to collect and regularly submit the project with the required data.  | No result discovered by the MTE. | No result discovered by the MTE. Unsatisfactory |
| 4.1.3. Process and present the data for monitoring the impact of the adopted policies and voluntary schemes as well as the other promotional activities of the project. | No result discovered by the MTE. | No result discovered by the MTE. Unsatisfactory |
| Output 4.2: Internet-based information clearinghouse  | www.label-ee.ru | It is a subjective opinion but the MTE deems the website to be far away from an ‘internet based information clearing house’. Moreover, many pages of the website are not functioning yet or have no content. Mildly Unsatisfactory |
| 4.2.1. Develop an internet-based portal that provides - in a user friendly way - information on efficiency ratings and other related information on targeted household appliances and technical building equipment. | www.label-ee.ru | The MTE would advise to make an independent assessment of the website in order to see if the site provides - in a user friendly way - information on efficiency ratings and other related information on targeted household appliances and technical building equipment.This MTE would question the level of ‘user friendliness’. Mildly Unsatisfactory |
| 4.2.2. Include and regularly update the information presented in the web, in particular energy performance data obtained from certified tests. | www.label-ee.ru | The MTE by 24.07.2013 did not receive the energy performance data obtained from certified tests. |
| 4.2.3. Promote consumer awareness about the internet-based information clearinghouse (in the framework of the activities under outputs 4.2 and 4.3). Websites of stakeholders should provide links to the information clearinghouse.  | The project reports to this activity as: “References to Internet-portal www.label-ee.ru have been included into information placed on business cards of the project staff, project staff presentations, project information materials and on web-sites of interested organisations, on UNDP web-site, web-site of Implementation Organisation "RUSDEM-EE".”  | The MTE by 24.07.2013 did not receive qualitative and quantitative date on consumer awareness and websites of stakeholders who provide links to the website. Mildly Unsatisfactory. |
| Output 4.3: Regional awareness campaign for household consumers  | A number of activities were carried out under this output. | The lion share of the activities under this output were carried out in, again, the period 25.08 2011 - 22.11. 2011. The MTE questions the effectiveness of a 4-month regional awareness campaign. Ideally, an awareness campaign would be something meriting attention during the entire project duration. Only 2 interviews given by the project manager and the PR campaigns in the earlier mentioned 8 malls have taken place at a more recent date (various dates in 2012).As verification sources in most cases one report of Intekhenergo MRS is mentioned. The MTE would like to see a report or reference from Mosenergosbyt in relation to all the activities mentioned in this output (and preferably in relation to all the activities and outputs where Mosenergosbyt was the recipient or partner). Mildly Satisfactory. |
| 4.3.1. Develop, in cooperation with the Government of the Moscow pilot region and Mosenergosbyt, a regional awareness campaign for household consumers, based on market surveys.  | Analysis of real situation in the field of public awareness efforts in work with household consumers as exemplified by OAO "Mosenergosbyt" was carried out. On the base of the conducted analysis a regional program was elaborated, including methodic and didactic materials, training methods and programs on improving energy efficiency of devices for two age-grades. Elaborated materials were submitted to Moscow City Government. | By 24.07.2013 the MTE did not receive answers on the following questions: MTE would like to know if the regional awareness campaign was only focused at the target group of “two age grades”. Please also explain what are the “two age grades”. The materials were submitted to the Moscow City Government. What was done with the materials afterwards?What was done for the target audience of household consumers? Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.3.2. Assistance to OJSC Mosenergosbyt in further developing their "Energy Efficiency Consultative Centre" as a customers information centre, exhibiting energy efficient appliances and providing information on energy efficient appliances and practices, including telephone and internet based services. | Barriers for improving efficiency of PR actions and consumers outreach activities in the field of usage of energy efficient equipment were identified. Assistance on further development of "energy efficiency consultative centre" was rendered to OAO "Mosenergysbyt". A collaborative program of "Energy Efficiency Consultative Centre" and the Project activities on EE S&L promotion were elaborated. Assistance on organizing information desks on informing consumers about energy efficient equipment and staff training was rendered. Methodical and information materials on EE labels were elaborated and shared among information service staff. | Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.3.3. Develop didactic material on appliance energy efficiency and energy efficient practices for residential consumers and for students of primary and secondary education. | Marketing survey for identifying informattion needs of household consumers and pupils was carried out. Didactic materials on EE household equipment and methods of energy efficiency improvement were elaborated regarding two groups of equipment: refrigerators and freezers and washing machines; and regarding two age-groups: elementary primary school and senior school. | Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.3.4. Organise information and training events on household energy efficiency for the general public and for students of primary and secondary education, including competitions on energy saving ideas and performance. | Educantional methodics was developed. Composition of trainees was identified. Showcase educational events on EE in household were carried out for 120 pupils and 10 teachers and for adults. Project manager was inerviewed by UN Radio regarding role fo S&L for Promoting of EE products to the Russian market and about the contribution of the UNDP ProjectProject manager was interviewed by the Radio "Voice of Russia" regarding problems of EE promotion in Russia and about the activities and achievements of the project.RP actions of EE equipemnt organised and held in 8 big trade molls. Results of these actions are analysed, recommendations for similar actions developed and delivered to RATEK Association members | Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.3.5. Assist district offices of Mosenergosbyt and sales outlets in setting up consumer information units/desks on energy efficient equipment. | Places for setting up consumer information units/desks on energy efficient equipment were selected. 5 information groups were creared in district offices of OAO "Mosenergosbyt" and in equipment sales points. Methodical materials for enquirry offices staff were developed and shares among enquirry offices staff.  | Mildly Satisfactory |
| Output 4.4: Information campaign for large commercial buyers  | Some activities have been carried out under this output. | Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.4.1. Carry out market research among large commercial buyers of technical building equipment, in order to identify information needs. | Market research among large commercial buyers of engineering building equipment was carried out. Information needs of large commercial buyers were identified. | Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.4.2. Develop, in cooperation with manufacturers and distributors of technical building equipment, technical documentation regarding the energy efficiency characteristics and options of products, focusing on the voluntary EE labeling scheme of the Moscow city government (activity 1.3.2). | Concept of technical documentation regarding energy efficiency parameters for engineering equipment, engineering systems, buildings and constructions was elaborated. The concept is aimed at Moscow legislative acts and normative and methodical acts ammendment. Materials were used when work implementation by ZAO SKM (See next line). Recommendations on voluntary usage of EE labeling of engineering building equipment and household appliance were elaborated. (See Recommendations on placing orders for engineering building equipment and household energy consumung equipment with respect of its energy efficiency by ZAO SKM). Materials were submitted to Moscow City Government.  | The MTE doesn’t understand to what extent this activity supports the fulfillment of the output 4.4. |
| 4.4.3. Organise information and training events for large commercial buyers and their purchasing officers. | Methodics on information campaign for large projecting organisations, including norms of heat and electricity consumption by buildings, taking into account Russian region peculiarities, was elaborated. Selection approaches in project solutions with usage of EE engineering equipment were proposed. Program on information and educational events on engineering equipment and building energy efficiency for large commercial buyers was elaborated. Training was carried out. Information materials and methodologies were elaborated and a training session for large commercial buyers and purchase department staff was carried out. Methodologies and training materials delivered to The center for International Industrial cooperation UNIDO in Russia. Informational an methodological materials developed. Training delivered to trade personnel of big commercial buyers of technical building equipment and to other groups of interested parties. Materials delivered to .... | The MTE by 24.07.2013 did not receive qualitative and quantitative information on the trainings provided within this activity. How many people were trained, what were their functions, they represented which organizations, etc. Also protocols confirming receipt of the training would be appreciated. To whom were the training materials delivered? MTE advises to make this clear and communicate it to the stakeholders. Mildly Satisfactory. |
| Output 4.5: Trained sales personnel for household appliances and technical building equipment  | Some trainings have taken place but qualitative and quantitative data hasn’t been received by the MTE yet. | Mildly Satisfactory |
| 4.5.1. Provide training on energy efficient products to sales personnel of household appliances and technical building systems. | Program, methodical and information materials for conducting trainings were elaborated. Trainings in amount of 14-20 hours were conducted for 59 workers of engineering building equipment sales departments from 6 organisations. Information materials and methodologies were elaborated and a training session for large comercial buyers and purchase department staff was carried out. Methodologies and training materials delivered to ......  | The MTE by 24.07.2013 did not receive qualitative and quantitative information on the trainings provided within this activity. How many people were trained, what were their functions, they represented which organizations, etc. Also protocols confirming receipt of the training would be appreciated. To whom were the training materials delivered? MTE advises to make this clear and communicate it to the stakeholders. Mildly Satisfactory. |

### Recommendations

1. Set clear Goals, Objectives and Activities in parallel and in accordance with the logframe. Clarify and simplify the project’s Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and activities without being detrimental to the Objective and Outcomes. Adjust the activities and outputs of the project design with the aim to make the project/logframe design more logical, strategically more relevant and more understandable.

As an example: Activity 1.1.4 mentions the “comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program”. On MTE question what this is exactly the PM answered: “I can only guess and do not know. It is a strange formulation. The Prodoc is not clear everywhere. It was written in 2008 and now we can only guess what the person had in mind”.

Another example: How does Activity 4.4.2. “Develop, in cooperation with manufacturers and distributors of technical building equipment, technical documentation regarding the energy efficiency characteristics and options of products, focusing on the voluntary EE labeling scheme of the Moscow city government (activity 1.3.2)” relate to Output 4.4 “Information campaign for large commercial buyers”.
2. Part of the selected equipment types are subject to mandatory S&L and part to voluntary S&L. MTE advises to set up different implementation plans for the voluntary and mandatory S&L schemes.
3. Calculations of CO2 emission reduction are based on research carried out over the period 2009-2011 whereas the project’s activities largely commenced in the second half of 2011. It is not proven to the MTE that CO2 emission reductions were achieved by facilitation by the project of market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances. MTE advises to carry out additional calculations covering the period 2011-2013.
4. The project concerns equipment types that are subject to mandatory S&L and types that are subject to voluntary S&L. Mandatory and voluntary S&L schemes require different approaches. First of all the project needs to draft concise and clear action plans for both voluntary and mandatory equipment types (Plan M and Plan V). Plans M and V should describe what needs to be in place to fulfill Outcome 1 and the overall Objective of the project as stated in the logframe. Then Plans M and V should describe what the total of actions is that should be taken in general to fulfill the Outcome 1. After that Plans M and V should describe what interventions/actions out of this total of actions the project will engage in. After that the workplans should be made, the remaining budget should be contributed to the various activities and the actions should be fitted in the proper places in the logframe and agreed with the necessary bodies. This is what a normal basic constructive approach to the project should be instead of just simply focusing at individual project activities. Such an approach would also have the added benefit that the project team and project manager would have more success in communicating to the outside world what they are actually doing.
5. Increase engagement of the stakeholders and engage on a continuous basis. Stakeholder engagement is not a one-off or ad-hoc activity but something that needs to be done during the entire project duration.
6. It is difficult to decrease the complexity of Russian legislation and regulations. Engage only in those legislative or regulative activities where actual effect can be realistically expected. Beyond that, design the EE S&L in such a way that it can function within existing legislative boundaries and reality;
7. Bring in foreign experts (like the people from CLASP or VTT or TNO) who have actual experience in designing and implementing EE S&L schemes to improve the logframe and function as long term project advisors. This MTE lists a number of suggestions in paragraph 4.0.3.b.
8. Complement continuous stakeholder engagement with continuous stakeholder training.
9. Enforce the project team and project management with additional project team members. A senior advisor to the project manager, a PR specialist and internal project analyst/consultant as soon as possible. Bring in communication, PR and networking capacity.
10. Create monthly M&E moments as the project needs more oversight and hands-on management. Set clear goals for the project team and project management and focus at clear deliverables and verify whether actual results achieved are supporting achievement of the outcomes and the final Objective. Teach the project team to manage by and focus on priorities. It is up to the project team and UNDP responsible organs to decide who should do this.
11. Bi-annual MTE type of reviews. Evaluate the results achieved more regularly and more critically. Set clear quarterly targets and deliverables for project team and project manager.
12. Start with a good strategic overview and implementation plan that describes in detail all the steps needed for establishing an EE S&L scheme.
13. Increase focus on capacity building inside the project team and increase attention to sustainability of capacity built outside the team.
14. Extend the project from May 2015 to December 2016. This would give a remaining three and a half years for the project’s implementation.
15. Rework the budget line items so that sufficient funds become available for hiring additional staff, bringing in foreign experts and moving to proper offices.
16. Develop a replication approach foreseeing to establish knowledge transfer, expansion of demonstration projects or capacity building and training.
17. MTE also questions how effective the NICB can be if it meets only once a year. The MTE also advises to hold bi-annual meetings.
18. A project like this should be approached in a structured way. It requires work on the international level of the Customs Union. It requires co-ordination with:
	1. Ministries of Economic Development,
	2. Ministry of Regional Development,
	3. Ministry of Industry and Trade,
	4. Ministry of Energy,
	5. Rosstandart
	6. Government of Moscow
	7. Government of Nizhniy Novgorod.

Doing a project like this without involving all these parties would create risks for the sustainability of its results. The reason for the need of involving all these parties is that there is a large number of diverse matters that need to be resolved. These matters for example relate to:

* 1. harmonization of National Standards and Labels of the member states of the Custom Union,
	2. harmonization, co-ordination and development of the different schemes of voluntary certification that exist at this moment (answering questions such as who is the label operator, who gives the label, what are the independent laboratories),
	3. clarifying the instruments of stimulation of adoption of standards (for example tax incentives, subsidies, esco schemes related to labels),
	4. mandatory advertisement,
	5. EE standards and labels for buildings and EE management of buildings,
	6. establishment of an information system on EE equipment
	7. establishment of a register of EE labeled equipment,
	8. propaganda
	9. education initiatives,
	10. and so on.

This MTE strongly recommends that the project formulates a clear and coherent policy and approach towards tackling this myriad of diverse matters that the project will have to deal with. The knowledge on what to do may exist in the brains of the different experts and contractors but the project would greatly benefit from having this approach written out and discussed with the various stakeholders. Just pointing at the Prodoc and workplans will not be sufficient to come to a satisfactory completion of the project.

### Main interventions: Extension of project duration, Substantive revision of project strategy, Enforcement of project team and project management.

#### Extension of project duration

Project implementation seems to be delayed and the project is likely to require an extension beyond its planned lifetime of five years from May 2010 till May 2015 to for example December 2016. It is unlikely that within the remaining project duration the remaining budget of USD 5,448,741.49 will be spent and all the outcomes will be fulfilled in a satisfactory manner.

Reasons of delay are the slow project start, slow project procurement and moderately unsatisfactory project management for the entire duration of the project and small size of the project implementation team and poor working conditions.

Extension should be granted under the condition that all the recommendations mentioned in this report are implemented.

An extension granted under conditions of an enforced project team and project management and of a substantive revision of the approach to the project implementation strategy in close consultation with project stakeholders should contribute to a successful completion of the project.

#### Substantive revision

It is not guaranteed that the Activities lead to the desired Outputs and the Outputs lead to the desired Outcomes. As such, one may question to what extent the overall project Objective will be reached when maintaining the current project strategy.

The changes suggested during the inception phase were mainly of a textual nature and almost exclusively related to the Final Value Targets.

The current logframe may not provide the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives.

For an EE S&L scheme to be developed logically the following steps need to be taken. These steps can be divided into a PLANNING PHASE and an IMPLEMENTING PHASE.

The PLANNING PHASE should take about half a year. The IMPLEMENTING PHASE should take two to three years. An extension of the project with at least 18 months would be recommendable.

My recommendation would be to:

1. Do a substantive revision based upon a specialist inventory of the actual results achieved and an inventory of the work still needed to be done. This work should be led by an international CTA with a standards and labelling background.
2. Extend the duration of the project with at least one and a half years
3. Make a new three and-a-half-year work-plan (from now till end of 2016) in the case extension is granted or a two year workplan in case extension isn’t granted.
4. Change the logframe by adjusting the activities and outputs while leaving the outcomes and objective unchanged.

#### Enforcement of project team and project management

Ideally the project team and project management would be enforced with additional project team members. A part time international CTA with an S & L background, a senior advisor to the project manager, a PR specialist and internal project analyst/consultant should be considered. Project management needs to be improved.

Monthly M&E moments should be created and clear goals for the project team and project management should be set. The project team should also be steered towards focusing at clear deliverables and verification of whether actual results achieved are supporting achievement of the outcomes and the final Objective. The project team should be stimulated to manage by and focus on priorities.

Considering the current state of the project, reviews should be carried out at least yearly and preferably twice a year either internally by UNDP or by an international CTA. The results achieved should be evaluated more regularly and more critically. Clear quarterly targets and deliverables must be set for the project team and project manager.

It is essential to start with a good strategic overview and implementation plan that describes in detail all the steps needed for establishing an EE S&L scheme; a roadmap for an EE S&L scheme.

The formulation of the outputs of the project design / logframe should be made formulated in a clear and unequivocal manner.

Capacity building inside the project team should be increased and closer attention must be paid to sustainability of capacity built outside the team.

### Lessons learned

1. It is critical to make sure there is a dynamic, experienced Project Team and Project Manager in place with the right skills and experience
2. Agree beforehand on the frequency, form and channels for dissemination of the intermediate and final project results.
3. For increased relevance have regular and meaningful stakeholder consultations. This means going way beyond the rare meetings of the NICB/Steering Committee or working groups. Stakeholder consultation and networking means that one must first create a clear, concise and regularly updated information package and keeping the stakeholder community informed on a continuous basis.
4. When projects include the establishment of electronic and / or media platforms then these outputs should be planned in a detailed way with a clear description of expected results.
5. Procurement procedures for national and international specialists should be in conformity with current market conditions so that the required quality can be attracted and recruited. This comment particularly refers to the long duration of procurement processes and remunerations that are not market conform (for example UNDP rates and remunerations are about half of rates and remunerations at IFIs like EBRD and IFC).
6. In this project the working conditions in the office in use during the MTE are substandard. It wasn’t even possible to conduct a normal MTE at the Project’s offices as there is simply no space to work. Co-locating new projects in the offices where Executing Agencies (i.e. EED in the case of this project) or existing UNDP projects are located will increase effectiveness and budget efficiency.
7. Increased involvement of international experts, from the outset of the project, who bring state of the art know how, international best practices, approaches and methodologies to the project in an early stage of the project will increase the effectiveness of the project. It is better to bring in foreign specialist than send the project team members on international study tours and fact finding trips. A foreign specialist will have a bigger effect and wider dissemination effect.
8. Press and media monitoring should be an integral part of the project. Ideally a PR and communications manager should be responsible for this.
9. Project design should seriously consider the inputs of all stakeholders.
10. Project designs that involve changes in legislation should set modest targets. Legislative changes require ample time to implement, possibly outside the timeframe of the Project.
11. Preparations are required to source specialized consulting services. Preparations include provision of ToRs that are not too restrictive (to not exclude a large number of international consultants), and identifying consultants through referrals, previous contracts or internet searches.

# Introduction

This report contains the findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation conducted during the months of April, May and June 2013 of the joint project of the Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, (GEF) and (UNDP): “Standards and Labels for Promoting Energy Efficiency in Russia” The timeframe for project implementation is 2010-2014. The Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation is to be the executing agency for this Project.

The project objective is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the residential, commercial and public sector in the Russian Federation through the implementation of energy efficiency standards and labeling for key household appliances and technical building equipment, along with complementary measures.

## Project background

The Energy capacity of Russian Federation economy (calculated on a base of purchasing power) is twice higher than in the USA, triple higher than in the EU and Japan.

Energy efficiency was included in a list of eight priority directions of future development of Russia by President. Russian energy strategy for the period up to 2020 includes improving energy efficiency as a main strategic aim. Energy efficiency standards and labels are tools for achieving the aim. Moreover energy efficiency is included in the State Policy Measures Program by President’s order.

After a long working out and consultations in November 2009 State Duma enacted a new Federal Law #261 FZ “On Energy Conservation and on Improving Energy Efficiency and on Amending Special Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation ” of November 23 2009 (which cancels Federal Law “On Energy Efficiency” 1996). New Law enters requirements to turnover of energy consuming units and rules for disclosing information on their energy efficiency; however there is no mechanism for implementation these measures. Many regulation measures and under-law normative acts shall be elaborated and enforcement mechanisms shall be defined.

Though a range of standards in the field of energy efficiency for domestic appliance and energy consuming equipment has been worked out and accepted as official technical standards (GOST Standards) since 1995 till 2001 (including energy efficiency standards for refrigerators, freezers and washing machines), all these standards have lost its mandatory character after Federal Law “On Technical Regulation” of 2002 was enacted. In accordance to this Law all national standards are applied on a voluntary base, excluding standards connected with protection of life, welfare, property of natural persons and legal entities, stare or municipal property. However there is no any real incentive for creation efficient system of voluntary standardization. In countries where there is not a great support for S&L schemes or where stakeholders are new to standards-setting and labeling and have limited resources, it is usually advisable to start with a voluntary labeling program until you are comfortable and the stakeholders are ready for a more ambitious program.

This full-size UNDP/GEF/RF Min Science and Education project aims to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the Russian Federation through the facilitation of wide-scale market transformation towards energy efficient technical building equipment and household appliances. In the scale of Russia this very ambitious target will be approached through a phased introduction of energy efficiency standards and labeling.

This envisaged to be achieved by four outcomes:

1. improving the national legal and regulatory environment and institutional capacities to facilitate the introduction and wide-spread application of a comprehensive energy efficiency standards and labeling program in Russia by starting it with the implementation of a full-fledged pilot program in the Moscow region;
2. developing energy efficiency S&L schemes and public procurement models, building the local verification and enforcement capacity and supporting the establishment of state-of-the-art compliance checking and certification systems and infrastructure in accordance with international best practices;
3. supporting manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders and establishing public-private partnerships, voluntary agreements and joint strategies to make energy efficient products more competitive and affordable to the population;
4. raising awareness of and providing access to information to targeted end users and buyers of equipment, including both household consumers and commercial buyers.

In the frameworks of the Project the following household appliance and engineering equipment shall be worked through:

a) household refrigerators (which are also covered by the EBRD, by the way) and freezers;

b) household washing machines;

c) water pumps;

d) industrial conditioners and fans;

e) cooling units for central air conditioning systems.

In doing this, the project is supporting the federal and regional governments in pioneering efficient regulatory and technological solutions and practices in the public buildings and in setting appropriately ambitious targets to the large commercial buyers among the Russian corporate sector. Reaching the stated targets of the project is expected to contribute to the reduction of CO2 emissions by 29.9 Mt until 2020 and by 123.6 Mt until 2030.

## Purpose and scope of the evaluation

### Purpose

This Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) is initiated by the UNDP Russia as the Implementing Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Russia Project Support Office and UNDP-GEF Bratislava Regional Centre) with concrete recommendations aimed at adjusting the projects strategy and activities in order to better achieve the projects overall objectives and outcomes.

The mid-term evaluation also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The mid-term evaluation will play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on: (i) how to adjust activities and outputs in the project in order to better achieve the project objective and outcomes; (ii) how to ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective; (iii) how to enhance organizational and development learning; and (iv) how to enable informed decision – making.

The mid-term evaluation should provide to the GEF Secretariat with complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and provides an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies issues and constraints associated with large international and multi-partner initiatives. Cooperation with other initiatives in the same area will also be evaluated as part of the work. The evaluation should also provide recommendations for strategies, approaches and/or activities to improve the potential of the Project to achieve expected outcomes and meet the objective within the Project timeframe. The evaluation might also make comments on the necessity of the project to be extended and under what conditions. Findings of this mid-term evaluation will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation of the current project phase over the remainder of the lifetime of the project.

The purpose of the MTE is:

1. To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework, and other related documents;
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project and recommend ways to make the project more effective;
3. To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project and recommend changes, as required;
4. To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
5. To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
6. To assess the sustainability of the project’s interventions;
7. To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management;
8. To assess project relevance to national priorities;
9. To provide guidance for the future project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements;
10. To make recommendations concerning proposed adaptive management requirements for the project over the remainder of the lifetime of the project to improve the results of the project

In particular, this evaluation will assess progress in meeting targets as defined in the project logical framework matrix and identifying any difficulties in project implementation and their causes. Based on this analysis, the mid-term evaluation will then recommend corrective courses of action. Effective action to rectify any identified issues hindering implementation will be a requirement prior to determining whether implementation should proceed.

Project performance will be measured based on the indicators defined in the Project’s Logical Framework Matrix (see Annex 2) and as adjusted at the project inception workshop. The project logical framework matrix provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. Success and failure will be determined by the extent to which the project has met or is on track to meet these defined indicators.

The Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions.

The evaluation is conducted at this particular point in time because the project has arrived in the 4th year of its 5-year term.

The MTE report is intended mainly for the UNDP Country Office in Russia, including Senior Management and the Program Unit staff, as well as UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre, UNDP New York and also the GEF Secretariat in Washington DC.

The information contained in the MTE report is needed to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project.

The information contained in the evaluation report will be used to assess the achievements of the project against its objectives and to examine the relevance of the objectives and of the project design including the options for undertaking adaptive management to improve the project results over the remainder of the lifetime of the project.

It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the project objectives.

### Scope

The MTE of the joint project of the Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, (GEF) and (UNDP): “Standards and Labels for Promoting Energy Efficiency in Russia” will be done in reference to the following documents:

1. Project document - http://www.undp.ru/index.php?iso=RU&lid=1&cmd=programs&id=164

2. Project Implementation Reports for 2011 and 2012

3. Project inception report.

In the inception report the Logical Framework Matrix was updated, along with a number of indicators which were revised to render more clarity and rigidity to the system. The evaluation should therefore be conducted against the revised project framework matrix and not against the original project logframe matrix.

The changes made in the Inception report were minimal and are listed below:

The Project outcomes and outputs, strategic results structure (logical frame matrix) and the Work Plan for 2010 and for the period of Project implementation were considered in details at the kick-off workshop and at the meeting of National Inter-Agency Coordination Body. The Project logical frame matrix was adjusted following the discussions. It was decided, in particular, as follows:

* **OUTPUT 1** Column: “Final value (target)”, to be supplemented with a requirement to develop a procedure for calculating CO2 emission reduction using the Rosstat and marketing survey data.
* **OUTPUT 2** Column: “Final value (target)”, to be supplemented with stating that the certification facilities have been tested for compliance with ISO IEC.
* **OUTCOME 2.1** Column: “Final value (target)”, to be partially amended as “developed based on the most recent international ISO IEC developments and approved best international practice in this area”.
* **OUTCOME 2.2** Column: “Final value (target)”: substituting “evaluated by independent international expert(s) and the recommendations implemented” with “passed evaluation for compliance with IEC standards”. Replace “A fully equipped laboratory for household appliance testing has been established by OJSC Mosenergosbyt.” with “A demonstration laboratory for household appliance energy efficiency testing has been prepared”.
* **OUTCOME 2.3** Column: “Final value (target)”: replace: “Energy efficiency guidelines … have been developed and published.” with “Technical regulations on energy efficiency … have been developed and published”.
* **OUTCOME 3** Column: “Final value (target): 1) delete “or lower than” shall be deleted from “The retail prices of the products in high energy efficient classes in the Russian market are comparable to or lower than in the selected reference countries”; 2) delete “and comply with the standards issued” from “The local manufacturers incorporate under voluntary agreements the EE labels into their marketing strategy and comply with the standards established”.
* **OUTCOME 3.1** Column: “Final value (target)”: delete “needs for adoption by production facilities of more efficient products”.
* **OUTCOME 3.3** Column: “Final value (target)”: delete “at points of sale”.
* **OUTCOME 3.4** Column: “Sources of verification” to be supplemented with “using the marketing research data”.
* **OUTCOME 4.5** Column: “Final value (target)”: to be amended as “Approximately 50 % of all sales personnel in major sales chins totaling more than 1000 employees and distributors trained in the pilot region selected”.

## Key issues to be addressed

1. Findings with the rating on performance;
2. Conclusions drawn;
3. Lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs;

## The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used

The outputs of the in-depth evaluation are expected to lead to detailed recommendations and lessons learned for the future.

## Methodology of the evaluation

The methodology of the evaluation follows the overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodologies as provided in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results. The evaluation method selected allows for rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria and respond to the evaluation questions.

The comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the completed project will focus on:

1. The tangible outcomes and on the way these outcomes were achieved;
2. Whether the outcomes were achieved in the most effective and efficient way;
3. The lessons learned.

For collecting the data for the evaluation the focus will be on desk research relevant documents, discussions with senior management and program staff of the UNDP Country Office in Moscow, in depth interviews with the project team, partners and stakeholders.

Subjects of the completed project evaluation:

1. Outcome status: is the desired project outcome achieved?

a) Revised project design

b) Process of implementation

c) Achievements vis-à-vis project objectives

d) Identification of Improvements based on previous project evaluations

2. What are the underlying factors, beyond the project team control, that influenced the outcome of the project?

3. What is the role and effect of the UNDP contribution?

4. Were the appropriate partners selected?

The applicable rating criteria are as follows:

6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings

5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings

4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings

3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings.

2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems

1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems

Ratings for **Sustainability** assessment are as follows:

4: Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability

3: Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks

2: Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks

1: Unlikely (U): severe risks.

**Additional ratings** where relevant:

N/A: Not Applicable

U/A: Unable to Assess

The methodology is as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| The evidence needed to address the evaluation questions includes: 1. Feedback on the project from stakeholders;
2. Feedback from UNDP project office;
3. Statements (answers to questions) by Project Manager;
4. Statements by Project Staff;
5. Documentary paper evidence such as:
	1. Reports;
	2. Business plans;
	3. Training materials;
	4. Financial and administrative documents.
6. Electronic files;
7. Press and media reports.
 |
| The data collection methods that will be used to address the evaluation criteria and questions are:1. Interviews
2. Desk research
3. Stock taking
4. Analysis
5. Cross verification of information received through previous 4 methods for consistency.

These methods are chosen because they are the only ones available given the resources allocated to the assignment.  |
| Data collection will take place during one field visit and several telephone/Skype interviews.The data in electronic and paper form will be acquired at the project office.  |
| Instead of simple sampling the evaluation will include a stock taking against every single project output and outcome.  |
| Analysis of the information collected and interpretation and reporting of the findings will take place during the period of April – July 2013. |
| Project reports will be submitted in draft form to the Project manager and UNDP project office for comments and revision. |

## Structure of the evaluation:

The report is proposed to adhere to the following components and be structured as outlined below:

1. **Executive summary**
* Brief description of project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
1. **Introduction**
* Project background
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues to be addressed
* The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation
1. **The project and its development context**
* Project start and its duration
* Implementation status
* Problems that the project seeks to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected
1. **Findings and Conclusions**

 ***4.1 Project formulation***

* + - Project relevance
		- Implementation approach
		- Country ownership/Driveness
		- Stakeholder participation
		- Replication approach
		- Cost-effectiveness
		- Sustainability
		- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
		- Management arrangements

 ***4.2 Project implementation***

* + - Project execution (including appropriateness of executing arrangements)
		- Project implementation
		- Project administration
		- Project planning
		- Financial management
		- Monitoring and evaluation
		- Management and coordination
		- Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

 ***4.3 Results***

* + - Attainment of outputs, outcomes and objectives
		- Project’s Impact
		- Prospects for sustainability
1. **Conclusions and recommendations**
* Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
1. **Lessons learned**
* Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance
1. **Annexes**
* Evaluation TOR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used (if any) and summary of results
* Co-financing and leveraged resources (see Table 1 attached)
* Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
1. **Other relevant material**

# The project and its development context

## Project start and its duration

The project document for “Standards and Labels for Promoting Energy Efficiency in Russia” (herein referred to as the Project) was signed on June 25th, 2010. The Project commenced operations in 2010 with the Project kick-off workshop.

The timeframe for project implementation is May 2010 till May 2015. The financing shall be provided in the form of Award accounting for USD 7,810,000. The Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation is to be the executing agency for this Project.

## Implementation status

The project reaches its completion date in May 2015. Up to now 60% of the project duration has expired. However, only 30% of the project budget has been spent.

### Main achievements of the project after 3 years under implementation are:

1. It hasn’t been possible for this MTE to establish the amount of the reduction of GHG emissions as a result of a market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances.
2. The MTE could not come to the conclusion that an institutional, legal and regulatory basis has been established and that the capacity of the national authorities has been built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region.
3. The NICB (as I understand it is the same as the Steering Committee) was established but it is meeting only once per calendar year. (Output 1.1)
4. The project was presented or represented at various seminars 9 times. 1 round table was organized, 1 seminar was organized and 1 meeting with press and experts was organized. There is room for improvement in this area. (Output 1.1)
5. Good results were achieved under Output 1.2. Various analyses of legal acts, proposals for amendments and draft legislation have been produced by the project.
6. Under Output 1.3 drafts of administrative acts have been developed but the MTE has not seen any indication of the acts being actually adopted by the Moscow City Government. Also the MTE has seen no results of the implementation – in consultation and cooperation with equipment manufacturers and other stakeholders – of the voluntary EE S&L program in the Moscow municipality, based on and in line with the EE S&L scheme developed under Output 2.1.
7. The MTE has seen no ready designed National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products. Neither has the MTE seen the emergence of a full cycle verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices.
8. Under Output 2.1 impressive results have been achieved where it concerns the development and adoption of testing and labeling standards. 5 standards have been developed and adopted in 2011. 3 standards have been developed in 2012 and are awaiting adoption and 2 more standards are planned to be developed in 2013.
9. Output 2.2 speaks of a system of compliance testing and certification. Some methods on compliance testing have been drafted. Some work with testing laboratories has been completed.
10. Output 2.3 describes the development of Procurement models for energy efficient equipment. Substantial work has been done towards fulfillment of this Output but the MTE hasn’t been able to discern any complete procurement models for all the selected equipment types.
11. The enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices may have been achieved but among a narrow target group.
12. The Training, Technical Assistance and Awareness Raising of Output 3.1 have almost solely received attention in the time period in between 12.08.2011 and 25.12.2011.
13. The Working Groups of Output 3.2 have been established but it has been difficult to determine their concrete effect.
14. Output 3.3 prescribes that voluntary agreements on product labeling and incorporation of energy efficiency in the market strategy of manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders need to be signed. Two such agreements were signed.
15. Work was done towards the achievement of Output 3.4. It would be good to know to what extent the reports made by organizations such as Ratek, Insolar and Termek actually ended up being used by the manufacturers, distributors, developers and banks.
16. The level to which awareness was enhanced and to which access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances was improved is open to debate.
17. Output 4.1 defines the creation of a “Market monitoring mechanism” to produce updated information on the sales of the target appliances by energy classes. The MTE has not received information about the existence of such a mechanism.
18. The Internet-based information clearinghouse mentioned in Output 4.2 is at this moment a relatively simple website. [www.label-ee.ru](http://www.label-ee.ru). The MTE regards the website to have been established but it wouldn’t go as far as to label it an “information clearinghouse”. As a simple website the site [www.label-ee.ru](http://www.label-ee.ru) is just about passable.
19. Meaningful work was done towards Output 4.3 (Regional awareness campaign for household consumers) but the activities mainly took place during a 4 month period in 2011 and were largely focused at school kids. Much more work will need to be done to come to a satisfactory fulfillment of this Output.
20. Some activities have been carried out under Output 4.4 (Information campaign for large commercial buyers) but the effectiveness of the information campaign is still a question to the MTE.
21. Under Output 4.5 sales personnel for household appliances and technical building equipment should be trained. Some trainings have taken place but qualitative and quantitative data hasn’t been received by the MTE yet and effectiveness of the trainings is still a question.

## Problems that the project seeks to address

The Project objective is to reduce electricity consumption and, therefore, СО2 emissions due to the use of energy efficient products for community services, industrial and public buildings, and domestically.

In November 2009 State Duma enacted a new Federal Law #261 FZ “On Energy Conservation and on Improving Energy Efficiency and on Amending Special Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation ” of November 23 2009 (which cancels Federal Law “On Energy Efficiency” 1996). New Law enters requirements to turnover of energy consuming units and rules for disclosing information on their energy efficiency; however there is no mechanism for implementation these measures. Many regulation measures and under-law normative acts shall be elaborated and enforcement mechanisms shall be defined.

Though a range of standards in the field of energy efficiency for domestic appliance and energy consuming equipment has been was worked out and accepted as official technical standards (GOST Standards) since 1995 till 2001 (including energy efficiency standards for refrigerators, freezers and washing machines), all these standards have lost its mandatory character after Federal Law “On Technical Regulation” of 2002 was enacted. In accordance to this Law all national standards are applied on a voluntary base, excluding standards connected with protection of life, welfare, property of natural persons and legal entities, stare or municipal property. However there is no any real incentive for creation efficient system of voluntary standardization.

This full-size UNDP/GEF/Min Educ and Science of the RF project aims to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the Russian Federation through the facilitation of wide-scale market transformation towards energy efficient technical building equipment and household appliances. In the scale of Russia this very ambitious target will be approached through a phased introduction of energy efficiency standards and labeling.

## Immediate and development objectives of the project

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the project is the reduction of GHG emissions by facilitating market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances.

OUTCOME 1

An institutional, legal and regulatory basis are established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.

OUTCOME 2

National S&L schemes for selected energy-consuming products designed and proposed and the required verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation in place based on international best practices.

OUTCOME 3

Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and, as applicable, other supply chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficient models into the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.

OUTCOME 4

Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency and other relevant characteristics of the targeted appliances.

## Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the Project include:

1. The Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation;
2. Ministry of Regional Development;
3. Ministry of Economy Development;
4. Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment;
5. UNDP Russia Project Support Office, UNDP BRC, UNDP NY, GEF
6. Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation;
7. Russian Energy Agency;
8. RosStandard;
9. Moscow Government;
10. Private companies;
11. Business associations (Ratek, Termek, etc.);
12. IFIs like EBRD, IFC, etc.
13. NGOs;
14. Internet community on energy efficiency.

## Results expected

1. Outcome 1: An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.
	1. Output 1.1: National interagency coordination body
	2. Output 1.2: Provisions for EE S&L under national law
	3. Output 1.3: Adoption of the required administrative acts for the Moscow pilot region to implement the pilot program
2. Outcome 2: National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products are designed and proposed and the verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices built.
	1. Output 2.1: Energy efficiency testing and labeling standards
	2. Output 2.2: System of compliance testing and certification
	3. Output 2.3: Procurement models for energy efficient equipment
3. Outcome 3: Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.
	1. Output 3.1: Awareness raising, training and technical support for local manufacturers on product and production technologies
	2. Output 3.2: Working group to elaborate public-private partnerships
	3. Output 3.3: Voluntary agreements on product labeling and incorporation of energy efficiency in the market strategy of manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders
	4. Output 3.4: Public-private partnerships and joint strategies to make energy efficient products more competitive and affordable to the majority of the population
4. Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances
	1. Output 4.1: Market monitoring mechanism to produce updated information on the sales of the target appliances by energy classes.
	2. Output 4.2: Internet-based information clearinghouse
	3. Output 4.3: Regional awareness campaign for household consumers
	4. Output 4.4: Information campaign for large commercial buyers
	5. Output 4.5: Trained sales personnel for household appliances and technical building equipment

# Findings and Conclusions

## Project formulation

### Project relevance

The project and its outputs and outcomes are consistent with national Russian EE policies and priorities and address the needs of intended beneficiaries.

The overall assessment of the project relevance is Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Implementation approach

This MTE has shown that the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out leaves much to be desired.

The quality of the inputs seems to be MS to S. However, with 60% of the timing for the project passed and with only 30% of the budget spent there seems to be some incongruence between the quality and the timeliness of the project.

Although individual inputs are delivered in good faith and reasonable quality one can question their impact.

The stakeholder interviews showed that several important stakeholders (such as EBRD, Min of Econ Development, Min of Regional Development, AEB and several equipment producers) are only mildly aware of the project’s goal, objectives, outcomes, activities and outputs. This points to a low effectiveness of the activities carried out.

Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping seems to be open to improvement. The Project team does not seem to use adaptive management in the project implementation. The project’s outline and timing as described in the logframe of the prodoc are rigidly followed without taking on board any impulses or information from, the surrounding (stakeholder) environment. I have seen no proof of the project management using feedback from M&E activities for purposes of adaptive management. Neither does the project management seem to use lessons from other relevant projects for incorporation into project implementation

The Implementation Approach leaves to be desired in terms of adaptive management and in establishing partnerships with relevant stakeholders in implementation arrangements and overall project management.

The overall assessment of the Implementation Approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Country ownership

The project is relevant to the Russian national development and environmental agendas. The Ministry of Science and Education is committed to the project. The Project Concept is embedded within the framework of activities and national sector and development plans of the main Russian Governmental stakeholders.

Outcomes from the project, such as developed standards have been adopted by the Russian Government and the relevant regulatory frameworks have been adopted, partly in line with the project’s objectives.

Relevant country representatives such as governmental officials and representatives of civil society are, if not actively involved in the Project’s implementation, at least interested.

The Ministry of Education and Science has maintained financial commitment to the project

As the project has a partial focus at the private sector and as several stakeholders are in the private-sector it is also important to look at the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project.

The interviews carried out in the framework of the MTE with private companies (such as BSH Siemens) showed that they definitely have an interest in the development of S&L Labelling schemes in Russia. In spite of this interest, the number of companies that participated in the project by receiving technical assistance, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project has been limited.

Also the efforts by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project by co-operating with the project.

Also the Project’s collaboration with industry associations such as AMCHAM, AEB and others, although in better shape than the cooperation with the companies, could be improved.

The lack of involvement of the private sector in the Project seems to be more the result of a lack of efforts on the side of the project than to be the result of a lack of interest from the side of the companies. The EBRD S&L project shows that there is a strong interest among equipment manufacturers in partaking in S&L projects in Russia.

The overall assessment of the Country Ownership is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Stakeholder participation

On the three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation the Project leaves much to be desired. The individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have, or could have an, interest or stake in the outcome of the project is too limited.

The project could do much more in terms of appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns. Information about the project is almost not disseminated. The Project has a weak website and no PR policy whatsoever.

The project could do more to engage NGOs, the community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities. Many of the stakeholders do not have sufficient knowledge of the project and thus do not know how they could engage with the project. Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of some stakeholders only happens when these stakeholders are invited as paid contractors to execute concrete tasks on behalf of the project.

The MTE has seen too little proof of effective partnerships being built among different project stakeholders. Stakeholders could be more involved in the project by increasing participation in project management and decision-making processes.

The private sector could be involved more actively in the project. The private sector is not being engaged sufficiently and further actions must be undertaken in order to enhance cooperation with the private sector

The dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders is should be improved.

Partnerships with EBRD and others must be improved and opportunities for stronger and or newer partnerships must be identified and capitalised upon.

PM explained that most potential stakeholders were contacted in the beginning of the project (2010) but that there was little interest at that time among them. MTE advises to re-engage the stakeholders

Some examples of stakeholders are mentioned below. By far not all of them are involved in the project.

1. Russian Federation Ministry of Education and Science.
2. Russian Federation Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology
3. Russian Federation Ministry of Energy
4. Russian Federation Ministry of Economic Development
5. Russian Federation
6. Ministry of
7. Industry and Trade
8. Russian Federation Ministry of Regional Development
9. Federal Agency of Technical Regulations and Metrology
10. Federal Supervisory Office of Consumer Rights Protection and Human Welfare
11. Federal Supervisory Office for Environmental, Technological and Nuclear Industry Issues
12. RSPP
13. RATEK
14. AVOK
15. Rostest
16. The Public Chamber at the Russian Federation President’s Office
17. Consumer Rights
18. Protection Society
19. State Enterprise “Moscow energy directorate”
20. Energy Service Holding Eskotek
21. Rossijskoje Teplosnabzhenie Non-commercial partnership
22. Moscow Office of Greenpeace Russia
23. Independent Environmental Rating Agency
24. OOO “Vodnaya
25. Tehnika”
26. Media Market
27. Eldorado
28. M-video
29. Technosila
30. Mir
31. Expert
32. Moscow Energy Institute (Technical
33. University) (MEI TU)
34. Moscow State Construction University (MGSU)
35. Nizhegorodsky State University R&D of energy efficient technologies
36. Moscow City
37. Municipal Services
38. Office
39. Moscow City Government Department for Fuel and Energy
40. Moscow City Housing and Utility Services Department
41. Housing Overhaul Maintenance Department
42. Moscow City Government Consumer Market Department
43. OJSC Mosenergosbyt
44. Association of Homeowners Associations
45. AEB
46. AMCHAM
47. RSPP
48. FESCO
49. RUSEFF
50. WWF
51. Delovaya Rossia
52. CENEF
53. Russia Green Building Council
54. TUV SUD Russia
55. FCO Prosperity Fund
56. Greenpeace Russia
57. SGS

A number of the stakeholders are also subcontractors to the project. Ratek and Termek are subcontractors but also take part in the Steering Committee and in all three working groups. Avok, Complex Monitoring Systems and Insolar Invest are subcontractors but also take part in the Steering Committee and at least one working group. The Steering Committee is supposed to approve the work of the subcontractors but what are the checks and balances if members of the Steering Committee approve their own work.

The overall assessment of the Stakeholder Participation is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Replication approach

It is too early to talk about any lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects.

There is no approach foreseen to establish knowledge transfer, expansion of demonstration projects or capacity building and training. This approach needs to be developed.

The overall assessment of the Replication Approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Cost-effectiveness

***The detailed Project Expenses Table can be found in ANNEX 7.02***

***The detailed C-financing Table can be found in ANNEX 7.03***

The ratio of budget versus outputs and results appears to be cost effective.

The achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs seems to be in proper relation to the inputs and costs. However, when considering implementing time and budget spent then the relations runs askew with 60% of the implementing time of the project spent and only 30% of the project’s budget being spent. Nevertheless, the predominant UNDP opinion is that the level of delivery/spending by the project for the past two years was ok (about a million/year) and that the delay in spending was incurred mainly during the project start/inception phase which is completely normal for projects of such complex technical nature.

The financing of the Project also seems to be in compliance with the incremental cost criteria as it is safe to assume that the project would not have taken place without GEF funding. Also co-funding has been assured through the Russian Ministry of Education and Science.

The Project is behind schedule in executing the planned activities but in the activities executed the Project has met the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned;

The Project does not use a benchmark approach or a comparison approach.

The overall assessment of the cost-effectiveness is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Sustainability

The project has only modestly mobilized action by the private sector to produce more energy-efficient appliances and led to substantial energy savings. The national standards developed by the project have been adopted and may lead to significant energy savings but the real effect of the standards is still to be seen. The extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end will be limited. There are no clear indications yet about the level of commitment of the government to support the initiative beyond the life time of the project.

The fact that the project is not strongly embedded in the stakeholder environment is a risk that is likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes.

1. **Financial resources:** The likelihood of public financial and economic resources being available once the GEF assistance ends is high as the Ministry of Education and science has a substantial budget earmarked for S&L and EE. The likelihood of the private sector or income generating activities being the source of post-project funding is low.
2. **Socio-political:** There are no social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes. However, because of the fact that other Ministries beyond the Ministry of Education and Science are not involved in the project that the level of stakeholder ownership by the government will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained. The various key stakeholders interviewed see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow but confidence in the project and knowledge of the project is low. There may not be sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project and this is an area the project should work on.
3. **Institutional framework and governance:** There is no reason to assume that there are legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes at play that may pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits. The Ministry of Education and Science is the right Ministry to work with because it is the only Ministry that has a lively interest in establishing an S&L scheme.
4. **Environmental:** There are no environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes.

The overall assessment of the sustainability is Moderately Likely.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Likely | Moderately Likely | Moderately Unlikely | Unlikely |

Using the four ratings recommended by GEF for evaluations pertaining to the sustainability of the project the results will be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project results | Rating |
| OBJECTIVE: The objective of the project is the reduction of GHG emissions by facilitating market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances. | ML |
| Outcome 1: An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.  | ML |
| Output 1.1: National interagency coordination body  | ML |
| Output 1.2: Provisions for EE S&L under national law  | ML |
| Output 1.3: Adoption of the required administrative acts for the Moscow pilot region to implement the pilot program  | ML |
| Outcome 2: National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products are designed and proposed and the verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices built.  | ML |
| Output 2.1: Energy efficiency testing and labeling standards  | ML |
| Output 2.2: System of compliance testing and certification  | ML |
| Output 2.3: Procurement models for energy efficient equipment  | ML |
| Outcome 3: Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.  | ML |
| Output 3.1: Awareness raising, training and technical support for local manufacturers on product and production technologies  | ML |
| Output 3.2: Working group to elaborate public-private partnerships  | ML |
| Output 3.3: Voluntary agreements on product labeling and incorporation of energy efficiency in the market strategy of manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders | ML |
| Output 3.4: Public-private partnerships and joint strategies to make energy efficient products more competitive and affordable to the majority of the population  | ML |
| Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances | ML |
| Output 4.1: Market monitoring mechanism to produce updated information on the sales of the target appliances by energy classes.  | ML |
| Output 4.2: Internet-based information clearinghouse  | ML |
| Output 4.3: Regional awareness campaign for household consumers  | ML |
| Output 4.4: Information campaign for large commercial buyers  | ML |
| Output 4.5: Trained sales personnel for household appliances and technical building equipment | ML |

### Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

Although there are many opportunities to link the project with other interventions within the sector these opportunities are not realized.

There is no co-operation with the EBRD S&L project apart from the EBRD’s invitation to the EBRD Project Steering Committee. Even more so, members of the EBRD Project Steering Committee complained about the dominant and aggressive behavior of the Project’s representative present at the meeting on June 25th 2013.

The MTE has discerned no proofs of effective co-operation between the Project and IFC and World Bank.

The overall assessment of the linkages between project and other interventions within the sector is Moderately Unsatisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Management arrangements

The project roles were properly assigned during the project design. The project roles are in line with UNDP and GEF programming guidelines.

The management arrangement model suggested by the project cannot yet be considered as an optimum model. The presence of an International CTA would be desirable.

The overall assessment of the Management Arrangements is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

## Project implementation

### Project Execution

Project Execution seems to have been moderately unsatisfactory up to now. In the execution of the project focus is mainly given to individual activities and their formal fulfillment. What is missing is an overall strategic approach to the project. The presence of an International CTA would be desirable in this respect.

The assessment of the project execution component of the implementation approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Project implementation

The MTE has shown that the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out leaves much to be desired.

Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project can be improved.

In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

The assessment of the Project Implementation component of the implementation approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Project administration

Project administration appears to be satisfactory. The audit reports for 2011 and 2012 stated: “The procedures performed to review the internal control system have confirmed that, in general, the internal control system complies with objectives and tasks and ensures effective use of the Project funds”.

For further detail I refer to the submitted audit reports for 2011 and 2012.

The assessment of the Financial management component of the implementation approach is Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Project planning

The use of routinely updated work plans can be improved and better communicated to project stakeholders.

The use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities is average and can be improved at least already by improving the project website.

Work planning processes are result-based but the main focus is at formally achieving individual results without keeping project strategy, goal, objective and outcomes in mind. It would make sense to re-orientate work planning towards strict logical alignment with project strategy, goal, objective and outcomes.

The assessment of the Project Planning component of the implementation approach is Moderately Unsatisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Financial management

Financial management of the project has been effective and prudent over the duration of the project. The audit reports for 2011 and 2012 stated: “The procedures performed to review the internal control system have confirmed that, in general, the internal control system complies with objectives and tasks and ensures effective use of the Project funds”.

For further detail I refer to the submitted audit reports for 2011 and 2012.

With 60% of the project’s duration passed and only 30% of the project’s budget spent one can say that the interventions were cost-effectiveness. The results that have been delivered seem to have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

The finances are audited yearly so there is due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Budget expenditure

The total budget (GEF) of the project is: USD 7,810,000.00

Of that budget on the total delivery in 2010-2012: USD 2,190,208.51 was spent.

Expenses according to the official delivery reports certified by auditors:

2010 – USD 22,512.50

2011 – USD 1,353,947.30

2012 – USD 813,748.71

Expenses for 2013 according to unaudited reports as per 04.06.2013 are USD 171,050.00

**The Remaining budget until the end of project: USD 5,448,741.49**

***The detailed Project Expenses Table can be found in ANNEX 7.02***

***The detailed C-financing Table can be found in ANNEX 7.03***

The assessment of the Financial management component of the implementation approach is Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Monitoring and evaluation

There are insufficient monitoring tools currently being used.

Project Steering Committee meetings are the main monitoring tool employed by the project and are rarely convened (once a year) and when they do take place the necessary information is not provided. A number of the key partners were present for the first time at the only Steering Committee meeting held in 2013 although it is the 4th year of the projects execution. As the attendants were not provided with information well beforehand the Steering Committee meeting was not very efficient and focused on formalistic requirements rather than high level strategic discussion. At the 2013 Project Steering Committee several participants commented that they had no idea what the project is doing. In particular, the Ministry of Regional Development and the Ministry of Economic Development commented that they were not informed of project activities.

Also quarterly narrative reports, annual reports (PIRs), delivery monitoring and discussions with the project team/project director are employed.

Nevertheless, additional monitoring tools are required and in particular an international CTA to guide the project and provide it with strategic vision is recommended.

The logical framework was changed in small detail during the project inception meeting but after that no changes were made to it. The logical framework does not seem to be used as a management tool during implementation.

UNDP has been tracking the performance of the project through various tools and already applied some adaptive management/fixing project management: the project manager has been replaced; the project team has been expanded, a private sector outreach expert has been engaged upon recommendation from UNDP, etc. There was some improvement in the project management but insufficient as outlined in this report.

The assessment of the Monitoring and evaluation component of the implementation approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Management and coordination

A project of this size and complexity requires strategic, decisive and strong management. This MTE has shown that management and coordination of the project needs to be strengthened.

The assessment of the Management and coordination component of the implementation approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

### Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

#### Risk Management

The risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and appropriate.

An additional risk identified is the moderately unsatisfactory management of the project.

The need to change the Project Manager in late 2011 was dealt with and managed effectively but unfortunately the effected change in management did not lead to major improvements in the project performance.

#### Reporting

Apart from the change of project manager the MTE has not identified any adaptive management changes made by the project management. Lessons derived from the adaptive management process have not been documented. Neither have they been shared with key partners nor have they been internalized by partners.

#### Delays

Project implementation seems to be delayed and the project, due to finish in May 2015, is likely to require an extension beyond its planned lifetime of five years. Reasons of delay are the slow project start, slow project procurement and moderately unsatisfactory project management for the entire duration of the project and small size of the project implementation team and poor working conditions.

A peak in project activity and delivery was noticeable in the second half of 2011 as mentioned in various instances in this report. The project delivery seems to have actually slowed down in 2012 compared to 2011.

The delay affected the achievement of project’s outcomes and/or sustainability mainly through a decrease of stakeholder interest.

An extension granted under conditions of an enforced project team and project management and of a substantive revision of the project strategy in close consultation with project stakeholders should contribute to a successful completion of the project.

The assessment of the Adaptive management component of the implementation approach is Moderately Satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Highly Unsatisfactory |

## Results

The outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project are in general Moderately Satisfactory.

The Sustainability of project results is Moderately Likely.

The project focuses too much at individual activities and at the achievement of the immediate outputs without taking into account what relevance these activities and outputs for obtaining the outcomes and their contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.

The implementation of the project has not been inclusive enough of relevant stakeholders and has not fostered in a satisfactory way the creation of collaboration between different partners.

The project has had no significant unexpected effects, either of beneficial or detrimental character.

The project’s Objective and Outcomes are consistent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities. However, one could question to what extent the Activities, Outputs and Outcomes lead to a logical fulfillment of the Objective of the project.

The actual project outcomes do not in all instances correspond with the project objective. The achieved and expected results are to some extent merely outputs/inputs. In order for the real outcomes of the project to effectively contribute to the project objective a substantive revision of the project and logframe would be in order.

The project has been cost effective thanks to the low level of activity in the first three and a half years of the project (70% of project duration has passed with only 30% of budget having been spent). It is hard to analyze if the project is the least cost option but it is clear that within the remaining budget EE S&L schemes should be able to be established.

The project implementation is delayed but it did not seem to affect cost-effectiveness.

### Progress towards Results

There are no major changes in development conditions. The project outcomes still contribute to national development priorities and plans in accordance with the Federal Law of the Russian Federation #261on *Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement* of 11.11.2009.

The key progress towards results of the project are mentioned above under Results.

The project could do more to consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in project activities. The project largely operates within a tight-knit network of NGOs and specialists who are at the same time used as contractors to the project.

When one compares indicators before and after the first three years of the project intervention to the baseline ones then one has to come to the conclusion that the change effected by the project is Moderately Unsatisfactory. The current conditions for energy efficiency in selected domestic appliances and technical building equipment (legal and regulatory frameworks, results of energy efficiency and energy conservation activities, etc.) have not significantly been improved compared to the baseline ones.

### Project strategy:

It is not guaranteed that the Activities lead to the desired Outputs and the Outputs lead to the desired Outcomes. As such, one may question to what extent the overall project Objective will be reached when maintaining the current project strategy.

The changes suggested during the inception phase were mainly of a textual nature and almost exclusively related to the Final Value Targets.

The current logframe may not provide the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives.

For an EE S&L scheme to be developed logically the following steps need to be taken. These steps can be divided into a PLANNING PHASE and an IMPLEMENTING PHASE.

The PLANNING PHASE should take about half a year. The IMPLEMENTING PHASE should take two to three years. An extension of the project with at least 18 months would be recommendable.

My recommendation would be to:

1. Do a substantive revision based upon a specialist inventory of the actual results achieved and an inventory of the work still needed to be done, led by an international CTA with an S&L background.
2. Extend the duration of the project to December 2016.
3. Make a new two and-a-half-year work-plan (from now till end of 2016) under certain conditions to be elaborated and agreed.
4. Change the logframe by adjusting the activities and outputs while leaving the outcomes and objective unchanged.

Practically, the PLANNING PHASE would deal with the issues described below.

The IMPLEMENTATION PHASE would follow largely from the results of the PLANNING PHASE.

#### PLANNING PHASE

Start with a good strategic overview and implementation plan that describes in detail all the steps needed for establishing an EE S&L scheme.

This plan should include:

1. Energy-efficiency labels and standards: an overview of the Russian situation benchmarked against best international practices.
	1. This includes analysis of international best practices and identification of key label infrastructure elements as well as studying of the current an possibly future Russian voluntary and mandatory labelling legal framework, institutional capacity and labelling experiences and making a gap analysis.
	2. As a result of this analysis, answers to the following key questions need to be provided:
		1. Should the S&L scheme be voluntary or mandatory?
		2. What should be the priority equipment types?
		3. Who should own the energy efficiency label?
		4. What should be the decision-making procedure for granting the label?
		5. What should be the fee system?
		6. How should possible disputes be resolved?
		7. At what level should the label criteria be set?
		8. How should the label criteria evolve over time?
		9. How to ensure compliance?
		10. Where the label should be placed?
		11. Should the label be linked to another international labelling scheme?
		12. What should be the label design and content?
		13. How to increase the general awareness of the label?
2. Take principle decision whether and how to implement voluntary or mandatory energy-efficiency labels and standards
3. Describe corrective actions needed to put the project on the right track
4. Design of voluntary or mandatory EE S&L scheme
5. Design energy testing scheme for appliances
6. Write detailed implementation plan of the voluntary or mandatory EE S&L scheme containing at least:
	1. a roadmap for implementation of the voluntary or mandatory labelling system,
	2. several preliminary indicative budget options for the voluntary or mandatory labelling scheme,
	3. a shortlist of unique selling points and expectations that will be used to engage manufacturers of the selected priority equipment types.
7. Describe procurement guidelines for the future voluntary or mandatory S&L scheme.
8. Analyse what needs to be done to set standards and to make necessary regulatory corrective actions
9. Design communications and training campaigns for labelling and standards-setting programs
10. Describe how the integrity of energy-efficiency labelling and standards-setting programs will be ensured
11. Describe how the impact of energy-efficiency labelling and standard setting programs will be evaluated
12. Make an inventory of Energy programs and policies that complement labels and standards
13. Make sure to engage stakeholders during the entire PLANNING PHASE and keep special focus at stakeholder engagement and communication plan.
14. Make Management Enforcement Plan.

#### IMPLEMENTING PHASE

Implementation will largely follow the components of the planning phase.

1. Implement corrective actions
2. Implement EE S&L scheme
3. Implement energy testing scheme for appliances
4. Implement procurement guidelines
5. Set standards and make necessary regulatory corrective actions
6. Implement communications and training campaigns for labelling and standards-setting programs
7. Ensure integrity of energy-efficiency labelling and standards-setting programs will be ensured
8. Evaluate the impact of energy-efficiency labelling and standard setting programs
9. Make an inventory of Energy programs and policies that complement labels and standards
10. Implement Management Enforcement Plan.

### Clasp guidelines for EE S&L schemes

The project should make sure whether all the CLASP guidelines are taken into account and respected. The MTE hasn’t been able to establish whether all of these guidelines are followed.

Ideally the project team would react to the following questions/remarks:

1. **Verify that efficiency labels and standards are appropriate as a basic element of your country’s energy policy portfolio.**
2. **Apply your scarce resources to the products likely to provide the greatest public welfare.**
3. **Select/announce programs for specific products only when you’ve identified the necessary resources.**
4. **Allocate sufficient time and resources to adopt a common product-testing procedure for each major appliance.**
5. **Focus first on certification of test laboratories and test facilities; if appropriate, leave actual testing to manufacturers and third-party testing organizations. Whenever possible, participate in regional or global harmonization of test procedures, and establish alliances with other nations working toward that goal.**
6. **Plan for involvement of manufacturers and all other interested stakeholders at appropriate stages in the processes of program design, label design, label specifications development, and standards-setting.**
7. **If you’re new to standards-setting and labelling and have very limited resources, consider starting with a voluntary labelling program until you are comfortable and the stakeholders are ready for a more ambitious program.**
8. **Allocate sufficient time and resources to analyse the effects of any potential standards.**
9. **The more the standards level remains grounded in a thorough, objective technical analysis, the greater the likelihood of political sustainability and subsequent compliance.**
10. **Be open to input from all stakeholders, and proceed in a transparent and responsive manner. Focus on what is best for the country in the long term. Be prepared to withstand strong political pressure.**
11. **Allocate sufficient resources to monitor, evaluate, and report the impacts of programs.**

### Project Management

The MTE has not been able to discern a great impact that the change in project management (Project Manager was changed in December 2011 (according to TOR December 2011 but PM said his contract was signed on 27 February 2012 and later rectified this as being 27 January 2012) and previous Project Manager was retained as a Senior Advisor, thereby increasing Project Management costs) had on the project strategy and on the progress of the project towards meeting results. The MTE has discerned no noticeable improvements but Project Management costs have increased for no additional visible results.

### Attainment of outputs, outcomes and objectives

See under Main Achievements above.

### Project Impact

See under Main Achievements above.

### Contribution of Implementing and Executing Agencies

The role of UNDP and the Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation have been co-operative and facilitating.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Rating |
| Field visits | MS |
| Participation in Steering Committee meetings; | S |
| Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up; | S |
| GEF guidance; | UA |
| Operational support. | S |
| Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP and the Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation in terms of “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). | UA |
| Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s and Ministry’s soft assistance and support to the project management. | UA |

# Conclusions and recommendations

## Conclusions

The overall impression of the project is that the project rates as MS.

The project rates S in terms of:

* Financial administration
* Project administration
* Execution of task related to developing regulations, standards and legislation.

The project rates MS in terms of:

* Procurement procedures
* Effectiveness of execution of activities in terms of tangibility of results (for example training, awareness raising, PR have received attention during a very short time frame of the project, a clear design for a S&L scheme, a real internet resource, and so on.)
* Impact of activities and outputs
* Stakeholder involvement
* PR

The main areas of improvement:

1. The general idea and design of the project is Satisfactory. However, the formulation of project strategy and design as described in the project’s Prodoc and Logframe can be updated to the demands of today. The project strategy as described in the Logframe and as worked out in the different activities could benefit from improvement. The Objective and Outcomes can stay the same but the Outputs and Activities need a substantive revision. Moreover, project implementation (See comments to the logframe and examples further in this MTE). At the least the Project Manager should reformulate the project tasks in practical terms and agree that with UNDP country and Bratislava office. In several instances the Project Manager couldn’t explain what the meaning of certain outcomes, outputs and activities in the Logframe were. Fore example activity 1.3.3. mentions the “Establishment of a group of adherents to the EE S&L program of the Moscow municipality. Participants in this group will adopt a voluntary obligation to submit their products to EE testing and to exhibit an EE label in their products. The Project Manager mentioned that nobody understands what this activity means. MTE advises to clarify. (further examples provided further in this MTE).
2. The project can improve its reporting skills and practices. When the MTE asked simple questions like: “what is the project about” or “what are the main achievements of the project” or “what is the essence of outcome 2” the project team immediately refers to produced and filed documents. In order for the project to have a bigger effect the project team needs to focus more at presenting the essence and the successes of the project in a more concise, practical and attractive way. Many of the reports submitted for evaluation have no file names, no reference numbers, no Tables of Content, no summaries and so on. This should be improved in the future.
3. Relatively small size of the project team and weakness of the project management
	1. There is the overall attitude that the project team consists of the subcontractors as well. This is not correct. Most of the work is done by independent contractors. These contractors have other jobs and responsibilities and are not employed by the project. A clear distinction should be made between the actual project team and the individual contractors. With the project team consisting of a project manager, senior specialist and an assistant the team has no other option than to outsource most of the activities to independent contractors. These independent contractors cannot really be considered as part of the project team. All the contractors have other primary jobs, sources of income and responsibilities. Consequently there is little capacity building within the team and a resulting dependence of contractors. There is only one project team member doing some legal and technical work. Compared to other projects this is not much. The MTE gave no reason to assume that any of the contractors did not perform or did not work in good faith. Nevertheless, contractors have a singular focus at the particular task contracted and are less concerned with achieving the overall outcomes and the objective of the project. As a result, the project as a whole lacks consistence, coherence and substance. Project management should provide more leadership, vision and technical skills instead of a strong focus at procurement and formal fulfillment of requirements.
	2. The project management and project team consider that the overall project implementation is Satisfactory. The MTE has not been able to discern any proof of self-criticism by the project team or project manager neither has the MTE been provided with any information concerning areas in which the project team and project manager might improve. There is an aggressively defensive attitude towards any criticism. This would be a worrying sign in any organization.

* 1. Project management focuses at activities, outputs, outcomes and objective in this order. Ideally project management would focus first at the overall objective, then at the Outcomes and only after that at the outputs and activities. In the various interviews the interviewees have confirmed the impression that the project team focuses too much at procedures and formalities as a result of which a strong focus at concrete results. Many of the activities carried out and results have an ad-hoc character. One gets the impression that often the “bigger picture” of the project is forgotten and that project management gets lost in administrative details and individual tasks.
1. The project team and project management lacks communication, PR and networking capacities. A PR specialist has been contracted to work one day a week for the project and has been active since May 2013. The MTE has a positive impression of this PR specialist but questions whether one day a week is enough.
2. Procurement procedures are considered to be too cumbersome by project contractors and project management. The MTE advises to raise the ceiling of the amount up to which no tenders need to be held and to simplify procurement procedures in general.
3. Project Coherence is low. The project concerns equipment types that are subject to mandatory S&L and types that are subject to voluntary S&L. Mandatory and voluntary S&L schemes require different approaches. First of all the project needs to draft concise and clear action plans for both voluntary and mandatory equipment types (Plan M and Plan V). Plans M and V should describe what needs to be in place to fulfill Outcome 1 and the overall Objective of the project as stated in the logframe. Then Plans M and V should describe what the total of actions is that should be taken in general to fulfill the Outcome 1. After that Plans M and V should describe what interventions/actions out of this total of actions the project will engage in. After that the workplans should be made, the remaining budget should be contributed to the various activities and the actions should be fitted in the proper places in the logframe and agreed with the necessary bodies. This is what a normal basic constructive approach to the project should be instead of just simply focusing at individual project activities. Such an approach would also have the added benefit that the project team and project manager would have more success in communicating to the outside world what they are actually doing.

1. The project misses a strong lobbying function. When documents are submitted to the different institutions someone should lobby for those documents to be adopted. The MTE advises to strengthen the lobbying function of the project.

## Recommendations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Identified problem | Recommendation |
| 1. Complexity of EE S&L schemes implementation in Russia
 | Set clear Goals, Objectives and Activities in parallel and in accordance with the logframe. Simplify the project without being detrimental to the Objective and Outcomes. Focus on a roadmap for a future voluntary or mandatory S&L Scheme as the main project outcome. |
| * 1. Low stakeholder interest
 | Increase engagement of the stakeholders and engage on a continuous basis. Stakeholder engagement is not a one-off or ad-hoc activity but something that needs to be done during the entire project duration. |
| * 1. Complex legislation
 | It is difficult to decrease the complexity of Russian legislation and regulations. Engage only in those legislative or regulative activities where actual effect can be realistically expected. Beyond that, design the voluntary or mandatory EE S&L in such a way that it can function within existing legislative boundaries and reality;  |
| * 1. Low level of EE S&L awareness and expertise
 | Bring in foreign experts (like the people from CLASP or VTT or TNO) in a long term role as project advisors. Hire an international CTA to guide the project towards a voluntary or mandatory S&L scheme asap. Complement continuous stakeholder engagement with continuous stakeholder training. |
| 1. Complexity of project strategy and design as described in the project’s Logframe
 | Adjust the activities and outputs of the project design with the aim to make the project design more logical, strategically more relevant and more understandable. |
| * 1. The project strategy as described in the Logframe and as worked out in the different activities could benefit from serious improvement. The Objective and Outcomes can stay the same but the Outputs and Activities need a substantive revision. (See comments to the logframe further in this MTE).
 | Bring in foreign experts who have actual experience in designing and implementing EE S&L schemes to improve the logframe. This MTE lists a number of suggestions in paragraph 4.0.3.b above. |
| 1. Small size of the project team and weakness of the project management
 | Enforce the project team and project management with additional project team members or strengthen the team in other ways. A senior advisor to the project manager, a PR specialist and internal project analyst/consultant should all be considered. |
| * 1. Project management focuses at activities, outputs, outcomes and objective in this order. Ideally project management would focus first at the overall Objective, then at the Outcomes and only after that at the Outputs and Activities.
 | Create monthly M&E moments. Set clear goals for the project team and project management and focus at clear deliverables and verify whether actual results achieved are supporting achievement of the outcomes and the final Objective. Teach the project team to manage by and focus on priorities. |
| * 1. Many of the activities carried out and results have an ad-hoc character. One gets the impression that often the “bigger picture” of the project is forgotten and that project management gets lost in administrative details and individual tasks.
 | Bi-annual MTE type of reviews. Evaluate the results achieved more regularly and more critically. Set clear quarterly targets and deliverables for project team and project manager and make adaptive changes in case of non-delivery. |
| * 1. Formally many of the activities are completed but the impact is often very low. Also reporting gives a “tick the box” character. The MTE detected that regularly form takes precedence over substance and that the focus is more at complying with reporting requirements than actually getting an EE S&L scheme of the ground.
 | Start with a good strategic overview and implementation plan that describes in detail all the steps needed for establishing an EE S&L scheme. |
| * 1. The project team is comfortable with executing separate legal or technical tasks but is incapable of putting theory into practice.
 | The formulation of the outputs of the project design / logframe is often rather vague and ambiguous. |
| * 1. With the project team consisting of a project manager, senior specialist and an assistant the team has no other option than to outsource most of the activities to independent contractors. Consequently there is no capacity building within the team and a resulting dependence of contractors. The MTE gave no reason to assume that any of the contractors did not perform or did not work in good faith. Nevertheless, contractors have a short-term singular focus at the particular task contracted and are only mildly concerned with achieving the overall outcomes and the objective of the project. As a result, the project as a whole lacks consistence, coherence and substance.
 | Increase focus on capacity building inside the project team and increase attention to sustainability of capacity built outside the team. |
| * 1. The project team and project management lacks communication, PR and networking capacities.
 | Bring in communication, PR and networking capacity with a full time PR and Communications manager. |

### Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

1. Project Design should be modified as described above. The Logframe should define clear targets for outputs and outcomes. Open ended or vague targets should be avoided. Targets and deliverables should have fixed time horizons.
2. Project Duration should be extended with 18 months or more years subject to certain strict conditions being met. A request for extension should be made shortly to UNDP New York.
3. M&E of the project should be done more regularly and more stringently. Monitoring and evaluation of the project results during the project should focus more at real on and quantitative results instead of solely focusing at whether the formal administrative requirements are met. This will allow for more stringent measurement and control of project outputs.
4. Upon continuation of the project it is advisable that the project manager and responsible person from the UNDP country office discuss, agree on the meaning of the project’s Objective, the Outcomes and the needed Outputs and Activities with a wide circle of stakeholders. It is suggested to focus on roadmap for introduction of a mandatory EE S&L scheme as a major focus for second half of the project.
5. Resulting from the discussion of the project’s Objectives and Outcomes the project manager and the UNDP country office should adjust the outputs and activities where necessary.
6. Special care should be taken by the project manager and responsible person from the UNDP country office that the work plans are harmonized with the Logframe.
7. It should be made sure that the members of the Project Steering Committee are actually interested in the project and see themselves as stakeholders of the project. There should also be a fixed schedule for obligatory stakeholder meetings as one stakeholder meeting per year is not frequent enough to guarantee strong stakeholder involvement.

# Lessons learned

1. It is critical to make sure there is a dynamic, experienced Project Team and Project Manager in place with the right skills and experience
2. Agree beforehand on the frequency, form and channels for dissemination of the intermediate and final project results. Focus on a few key results as explained above in Chapters 1 and 4.
3. For increased relevance have regular and meaningful stakeholder consultations with a wide range of stakeholders.
4. When projects include the establishment of electronic and / or media platforms then these outputs should be planned in a detailed way with a clear description of expected results.
5. Procurement procedures for national and international specialists should be in conformity with current market conditions so that the required quality can be attracted and recruited.
6. In this project the working conditions in the office in use during the MTE are substandard. It wasn’t even possible to conduct a normal MTE at the Project’s offices as there is simply no space to work. Co-locating new projects in the offices where Executing Agencies (i.e. EED in the case of this project) or existing UNDP projects are located will increase effectiveness and budget efficiency.
7. Increased involvement of international experts, from the outset of the project, who bring state of the art know how, international best practices, approaches and methodologies to the project in an early stage of the project will increase the effectiveness of the project. This also concerns international study tours and fact finding trips.
8. Press and media monitoring should be an integral part of the project.
9. Project work plans should seriously consider the inputs of all stakeholders.
10. Project designs that involve changes in legislation should set modest targets. Legislative changes require ample time to implement, possibly outside the timeframe of the Project.
11. ToRs for sourcing specialized consulting services should not be too restrictive (to not exclude a large number of international consultants), and one should aim to identifying consultants through referrals, previous contracts or internet searches.

# Annexes

## Logical Framework

| **PROJECT STRATEGY (objectives, outcomes, outputs)** | **Indicator description** | **Baseline** | **Final value (target)** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions/risks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE**Reduction of GHG emissions by facilitating market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances.  | The amount of GHG emissions reduced compared to the expected baseline development  | No incremental CO2 reduction compared to the projected baseline (see prodoc section IV, part V). | National level:Cumulative, incremental CO2 emission reduction (with a causality factor 4) of 7.8 Mt of CO2eq by 2015 and 29.9 Mt by 2020. Pilot region (Moscow):Cumulative, incremental CO2 emission reduction of 1.89 Mt of CO2eq by 2015 and 6.86 Mt by 2020.  | The GHG emission reduction and market monitoring reports prepared under the M&E component of the project. | Continuing interest of key stakeholders to co-operate and contribute to reaching the set targets. The price of EE appliances vs. electricity costs justify their purchase  |
| **OUTCOME 1**An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project. | Availability of specific organisational arrangements to promote the introduction of the S&L schemesStatus of the proposed legal and regulatory amendments and voluntary agreements at the federal and city government (regional) level.  | At the Federal Government level no responsibilities are defined or organisational structures established for the development of EE S&L schemes. Inadequate legal and regulatory framework to effectively promote S&L schemes and lack of awareness of key policy makers (together with other institutional barriers) to adopt the required amendments at the Federal level. | A National Inter-Agency Coordination Body (NICB) has been established The required legal and regulatory amendments have been adopted at the regional (city government) level for the implementation of a full scale (voluntary) S&L program in line of what can be later expanded to a mandatory scheme at the Federal level. Proposals for the required amendments in federal laws to facilitate introduction of mandatory S&L at the national level have been submitted for the Government consideration.Implementation of EE S&L started in at least one additional Russian region beyond Moscow City. | Certificate of constitution of the NICB.Administrative orders of the Moscow City GovernmentVoluntary agreements between the Moscow City Government and stakeholders Project progress reports  | The members of NICB will allocate sufficient human and financial resources to effectively work on the proposed S&L schemesContinuing commitment of the Moscow city government to support the implementation of a full scale S&L program in Moscow.  |
| **Output 1.1**National Inter-Agency Coordination Body | Status of the National Inter-Agency Coordination Body  | At the level of the Federal Government, no co-ordination body and promoter of the appliance S&L policies currently exist.  | A National Inter-Agency Coordination Body (NICB) has been established and is acting as a manager and promoter of EE S&L under the leadership of the Ministry of Education and Science | Certificate of constitution of the NICB. Records of proceedings of regular meetings of the NICB  | The Federal Gov’t will assign a responsible agency for the EE S&L program and for creating NICB. |
| **Output 1.2**A proposal for the suggested amendments in federal legislation to facilitate mandatory EE S&L submitted to federal authorities | Status of the proposal(s) for the amendment of the Federal Law on Technical Regulation and of secondary legislation to implement the new Law on Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement  | The Federal Law on Technical Regulation of 2002 does not allow mandatory EE S&L. The new Law on Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement (replacing the Law on Energy Saving of 1996) is presently under consideration of the State Duma.Institutional barriers of amending federal legislation. | Proposals for the amendment of the Federal Law on Technical Regulation to allow mandatory EE S&L, including MEPS, are prepared and submitted to the authorities.Adequate secondary legislation to effectively implement mandatory EE S&L and MEPS in accordance with the new Law on Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement has been drafted and submitted to the authorities. | Official communication to the authorities in charge (Minpromtorg, State Duma, Expert Committee for Technical Regulation of the Federal Government) | Due to complex institutional procedures to amend any federal law, the actual adoption of the suggested legal amendments at the federal level may not take effect during the implementation of the project.  |
| **Output 1.3**Adoption of all the required legal and regulatory changes by the Moscow city government to facilitate the implementation of a full scale S&L pilot program in the Moscow region  | Status of the suggested legal and regulatory amendments and administrative orders. Status of implementation of the voluntary EE S&L program in Moscow.  | A fully supportive legal and regulatory framework to facilitate the implementation of a full scale S&L program in Moscow region not established yet.  | All the required regulatory changes adopted and administrative orders issued to support the implementation of a voluntary EE S&L program (in line with what can be later expanded to a mandatory federal EE S&L scheme). This will include, but is not necessary limited to: * Administrative orders of the Moscow City Government defining the voluntary EE S&L program, its scope and criteria.
* Voluntary agreements to implement the program signed by the Moscow City Gov’t and the key supply side stakeholders.
* Administrative orders for minimum energy performance standards of building equipment for public procurement.
 | Administrative orders issuedProgress reports on the implementation of the voluntary EE S&L program. | Continuing commitment of the Moscow City Government to support the implementation of a full scale S&L program in Moscow. The initial analysis conducted during the project preparatory phase concluded that the suggested measures should not be in conflict with any federal laws, so this remains as an assumption.  |
| **OUTCOME 2**National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products designed and proposed and the required verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation in place based on international best practices. | Content of official GOST-standards for EE testing and labeling of targeted appliances and equipmentAvailability of a fully operational system of compliance testing, including test procedures and accredited test laboratories for full product and regional coverage.Availability of technical EE guidelines for public procurement   | See outputs 2.1 – 2.3  | Updated EE testing and labelling standards following international best practices and most recent technology development for selected priority appliances and technical building equipment published as official GOST-standards. A fully elaborated, capacitated and transparent compliance checking and enforcement system in place meaning that the required EE testing and labeling standards are available as official GOST-standards and the certification system and facilities (test laboratories and certification bodies) have been evaluated to meet the international standards. Finalized guidelines and suggested criteria for promoting energy efficient building equipment in public procurement. | Published GOST-standards Independent international expert evaluation of the established compliance checking system and facilities. Project progress reports  | The review of existing and elaboration of new EE testing and labeling standards and the adaptation of the existing testing system and facilities, including ROSTEST test laboratories, for the specific requirements of compliance checking of the selected appliances and equipment is expected to proceed smoothly without facing significant administrative or other similar barriers.  |
| **Output 2.1**New and/or updated energy efficiency testing and labeling standards developed.  | Status and content of the GOST-standards for targeted appliances  | Various GOST-standards for energy consuming appliances and equipment were elaborated between 1995 - 2001, but cannot be implemented as mandatory because of the restrictions due to the Federal Law on Technical Regulation. There is also a need for reviewing and updating of existing and development of new standards by taking into account the international best practices and recent developments in this field. | New and updated GOST-standards for energy efficiency test procedures and for EE labeling of selected appliances and equipment (incl. household refrigerators and freezers, household washing machines, water pumps, industrial air conditioners and fans and chillers for central air-conditioning) published, taking into account the most recent international developments and recognized international best practices in this field. Additional appliances and equipment subject to EE S&L identified. | Published GOST-standards  | Efficient management of the process by the national standardization institute avoiding undue delays and productive consultations with stakeholders to reach consensus. .  |
| **Output 2.2**Evaluation and improvement of the existing compliance checking, enforcement and certification system and facilities  | The status of the compliance testing and certification system in place  | A system of compliance testing and certification of test results by accredited organisations is in place, but requires an evaluation and possible upgrading. | Voluntary certification schemes for energy efficiency compliance testing, compatible with the federal system of compliance certification have been implemented.The existing compliance testing, certification and enforcement system has been evaluated by independent international expert(s) and the recommendations implemented. A fully capacitated laboratory for testing of household appliances has been established by OJSC Mosenergosbyt. | Project progress reports | Taking into consideration the high level of expertise available in the Russian organisations for standardisation, certification and accreditation, and the existing network of test laboratories (ROSTEST), it is assumed that this system can easily be adapted to the requirements of EE testing  |
| **Output 2.3**Energy efficiency procurement models | Status of the technical guidelines concerning the minimum energy efficiency standards for public procurement  | Although allowed by the Federal Law on Placing Orders for the Supply of Goods, Performance of Works and Provision of Services for Public and Municipal Needs, no guidelines and criteria are available to promote the purchase of energy efficient equipment and appliances in public procurement. | Energy efficiency guidelines, including minimum energy performance standards, for the procurement of technical building equipment and systems (HVAC, industrial air conditioners and fans, pumps) and, as applicable, for other appliances have been developed and published.  | Project progress reports  | Continuing commitment of the Moscow city government to support this subcomponent  |
| **OUTCOME 3**Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and, as applicable, other supply chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficient models into the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices. | The price – energy efficiency – quality relation of the products available in the Russian market | The market of many household appliances and building equipment is characterized by relatively high shares of more efficient and higher priced imported products, but it still lacks efficient appliances that would be affordable to low and medium income consumers.Lack of experience of Russian companies with EE S&L schemes. | The retail prices of the products in high energy efficient classes in Russian market are comparable to or lower than in selected reference countries By voluntary agreements, the local manufacturers are incorporating EE labels into their marketing strategy and comply with the standards issued. | Regular market monitoring and evaluation reports | Continuing interest of the local manufacturers and other parts of the supply chain to compete with the energy efficiency of their products and to consider it as an elementary part of their marketing and product development strategy |
| **Output 3.1** Awareness raising and training of local manufacturers to improve the energy efficiency of their products in a competitive way and to effectively use that in their marketing strategy, including EE labels.  | The number and market share of local manufacturers that have benefitted from technical support provided by the project.  | While foreign companies (incl. those with production facilities in Russia) supplying appliances and technical building equipment to the Russian market are familiar with the EE S&L schemes of their countries of origin and world-wide, Russian manufacturers still lack this experience. | Following the identification of their specific needs, local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment have been trained and received technical assistance in energy efficient product design, needs for adoption of production facilities to more efficient products, and experiences with EE S&L of foreign and multi-national appliance and equipment manufacturers. | Project progress reportsSurvey of training and technical assistance needs of local manufacturers.Agendas and reports of training courses realized.Terms of reference and reports of technical assistance provided. | See above  |
| **Output 3.2**A working group of private sector stakeholders, members of the Inter-agency Coordination Body and other interested parties to elaborate the possible public-private partnerships | Status of working group operation | No established forums between (local) authorities and private sector stakeholders (such as manufacturers, retailers, private sector buyers, corporate energy consumers, energy distribution and service companies) to discuss and elaborate possible public-private partnerships in promoting the adoption of the EE S&L schemes and the sale of EE appliances | A working group of private sector stakeholders, members of the Inter-agency Coordination Body and other interested parties established to elaborate the possible public-private partnerships in promoting the adoption of the EE S&L schemes and the sale of EE appliances. | Project progress reportsMinutes of the working group  | The feasibility and foreseen mutual benefits and interest of the targeted stakeholders to consider public-private partnerships as the preferred *modus operandi* to influence the market (risk medium) |
| **Output 3.3** Voluntary agreements with the interested manufacturers and other supply chain stakeholders on product labeling and incorporation of EE aspects into their marketing strategy | Number and market share of the manufacturers that have signed a voluntary agreement. | No product labeling in the Russian market (except some labels of the countries of origin of few imported appliances).Energy efficiency S&L are not part of local manufacturers’ marketing strategies. | Voluntary agreements concerning product labeling at sales points and inclusion of EE information in product documentation have been negotiated and concluded with manufacturers and distributors of household appliances and technical building equipment | Project progress reports | Foreseen mutual benefits and interest of supply chain stakeholders to co-operate on the suggested voluntary EE labeling scheme |
| **Output 3.4**Elaborated joint strategies and mechanisms to make energy efficient products more competitive and affordable to the majority of the local population and established public-private partnerships to implement these strategies | Status of implementation of the elaborated strategies and mechanisms | No specific market enhancement mechanisms implemented and supported as public-private partnership. | Agreed joint marketing strategies with the local manufacturers and other supply chain stakeholders.Attractive pricing policies, and preferential consumer credits and/or incentives for energy efficient appliances available, connected to the marketing strategy of the local supply chain and used by the consumers. As applicable, development and implementation of corporate procurement programs - using certified and labeled technical building equipment. | Project progress reports | Interest of the local financing institutions, public authorities, manufacturers and other supply chain stakeholders to co-operate in the elaboration and financing of the agreed market enhancement mechanisms as a public-private partnership.  |
| **OUTCOME 4**Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency and other relevant characteristics of the targeted appliances and equipment from the life-cycle costs and environmental perspective.Market monitoring mechanism. | Level of awareness of residential and commercial customers on the purpose of the suggested EE S&L schemes and access to non-partial information on the economic and environmental benefits of energy efficient equipment, when comparing the different products in the market. The share of customers who have considered energy efficiency aspects in their last purchasing decision.  | Lack of visible and non-partial information on energy performance of different products and relatively low attention on energy efficiency aspects by household consumers and commercial buyers. | In the selected target region over 80 % of the interviewed group of customers that are currently considering or have purchased one or more of the appliances / equipment targeted by the project during its implementation have been exposed to one or more of the awareness raising activities of the project and for more than 50% this has influenced their purchasing decision. | Consumer surveys and interviews at the sales points.Project reports.  | The electricity costs or environmental considerations are at the high enough level to awake and sustain the interest of the targeted customers to obtain information on energy efficiency performance of products considered for purchase. |
| **Output 4.1** An established market monitoring mechanisms to produce updated information on the sales of the targeted appliances by energy classes. | Status of the market monitoring reports | Inadequate or outdated market information. | Annual (or bi-annual) market monitoring reports published with updated information on the sale of the targeted appliances by energy classes. | Project progress reports | Access to reliable information from the market |
| **Output 4.2**Internet-based information clearinghouse | Status and usefulness of the web-site. | Information on energy efficiency and related performance characteristics of household appliances and technical building equipment is not readily available.It is therefore difficult for consumers (both private households and commercial buyers) to make purchase decisions with due regard on the energy efficiency of products.  | An internet-based energy efficiency information clearinghouse on energy consuming products established and updated regularly with EE information and its impact on the operating costs of the selected appliances, non-partial product information, certified test results, available financing support schemes (as applicable) and other relevant information to help consumer choices between the different appliances available in the Russian market and judge the importance of energy efficiency considerations in general.  | User statistics and feedback.Number of websites linked to information clearinghouseRegular review of the information placed on the website  | Assignment of adequate resources for active collection, processing and updating of the information. Availability of the certified testing information.Sustainability of the website after the end of the project   |
| **Output 4.3**Regional awareness campaign for household consumers | Status of the planned activities  | Household consumers lack reliable information on energy efficiency characteristics and options of household appliances | A regional awareness campaign has been developed and implemented in the Moscow region, in cooperation with the Moscow City Government and OJSC Mosenergosbyt, including:- The establishment of a customer’s information centre at OJSC Mosenergosbyt- Didactic material on appliance energy efficiency and energy efficient practices elaborated and available- Information, training events and EE competitions realised- Consumer information units/desks established at Mosenergosbyt district offices and at sales outlets. | Project progress reports. | Continuing interest of the Moscow City Government, OJSC Mosenergosbyt and other key stakeholders to co-operate in the realisation of the campaign (low risk).  |
| **Output 4.4**Information campaign for large commercial buyers | Status of the planned activities | Large commercial buyers like project developers, investors, general contractors of construction projects, owners and operators of commercial buildings, public building operators and housing associations - lack reliable information on energy efficiency characteristics and options of technical building equipment | A regional information campaign on energy efficiency building equipment implemented, focusing primarily - but not exclusively - on the region of Moscow, including:- Confirmation of information needs by market research among large commercial buyers of technical building equipment- Technical documentation regarding energy efficiency characteristics and options of products- Information and training events for large commercial buyers and their purchasing officers | Project progress reports | The electricity costs are high enough to awake and sustain the interest of large commercial buyers in obtaining information on energy efficiency performance and options for technical building equipment. |
| **Output 4.5** Trained sales personnel of the household appliances and technical building equipment.  | Share of the trained sales personnel in the selected pilot region  | Lack of information among the sales personnel to adequately inform the targeted customers on the energy performance of the different products and how it should be taken into account in the purchasing decision.  | Over 50 % of all the sales personnel trained in the selected pilot region  | Project progress reports  | Foreseen mutual benefits by the sales personnel of getting trained.   |

**Annex 2: RATE TABLES**

Table 1. STATUS OF OBJECTIVE / OUTCOME DELIVERY AS PER MEASURABLE INDICATORS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item to be assessed | Status of delivery | Relevance | Effectiveness | Efficiency | Impact |
| Objective / Outcome / Output / Activity |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective: The objective of the project is the reduction of GHG emissions by facilitating market transformation towards more energy efficient building equipment and appliances. | UA | S | UA | UA | UA |
| Outcome 1: An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.  |  | HS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 1.1: National interagency coordination body  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 1.1.1. Establish the National Interagency Coordination Body (NICB). |  | MS | MS | S | MS |
| 1.1.2. Confirm the detailed agenda of the activities to be developed under the project, including the detailed work plan, seeking consensus among the members of the National Interagency Coordination Body. |  | MS | MS | S | MS |
| 1.1.3. Organise seminars and round-tables for decision makers of ministries, government agencies, legislators and other policy makers. |  | MS | MS | S | MS |
| 1.1.4. Supervise the implementation of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program to track the progress and provide feedback for the improvement/adjustment of the EE S&L instruments implemented. Direct and indirect global environmental benefits (reduction of CO2 emissions) will be assessed and reported, under the overall responsibility of the NICB (see also output 4.1). |  | MS | MS | S | U |
| 1.1.5. Ensure replication of EE S&L schemes in at least one additional pilot region beyond Moscow. Nizhny Novgorod region has been selected for replication. Following completion of initial piloting phase with the Moscow city Government additional regions for replication might be identified.  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| Output 1.2: Provisions for EE S&L under national law  |  | MS | S | S | MS |
| 1.2.1. Prepare proposals for the amendment of the Federal Law on Technical Regulation, or pertinent Government resolutions (see output 2.1), in order to allow the adoption of mandatory energy efficiency labeling and minimum efficiency performance standards (MEPS) at the federal level. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 1.2.2. Review the stipulations that concern EE S&L in the new “Law on Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement” and support development of the required secondary regulations. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 1.2.3. Submit the legal proposals elaborated under activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 to the relevant federal ministries, to initiate the public discussion on the suggested amendments or regulations (involving interested ministries) and its submission to the State Duma and the Expert Committee for Technical Regulation of the Federal Government respectively. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 1.3: Adoption of the required administrative acts for the Moscow pilot region to implement the pilot program  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 1.3.1. Adopt the required regulations for the Moscow pilot region to allow the implementation of a voluntary EE S&L scheme within the region, including the establishment of legal and administrative rules for such a program. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 1.3.2. Implement – in consultation and cooperation with equipment manufacturers and other stakeholders – a voluntary EE S&L program in the Moscow municipality (pilot region), based on and in line with the EE S&L scheme developed under Output 2.1. |  | UA | UA | UA | UA |
| 1.3.3. Establish a group of adherents to the EE S&L program of the Moscow municipality. Participants in this group will adopt a voluntary obligation to submit their products to EE testing and to exhibit an EE label in their products. |  | UA | UA | UA | UA |
| 1.3.4. Develop and implement EE labeling and minimum energy performance requirements for appliances and technical building equipment purchased under public procurement activities. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 1.3.5. Prepare a model for replicating local regulatory and public procurement schemes to other Russian regions and implement targeted replication in at least one region (Nizhny Novgorod region). |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Outcome 2: National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products are designed and proposed and the verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices built.  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 2.1: Energy efficiency testing and labelling standards  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 2.1.1. Develop test procedures for the selected household appliances and technical building equipment/systems to be published as GOST-standards, following the usual procedures for the elaboration and publication of technical standards (as defined by the International Organization for Standardization). The proposed test procedures will be based on international, in particular ISO/IEC standards. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 2.1.2. Continue and refine the market assessments realized in the preparatory phase of the project, with the objective to establish an order of priority and time frame for the inclusion of additional household and technical building equipment in the EE S&L program.  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 2.1.3. Develop energy efficiency labels for the selected household appliances and technical building equipment. Label design will be based on surveys among consumers and manufacturers and take into consideration existing labeling schemes, including the EU-label for household appliances and labeling schemes proposed by European manufacturers for building equipment. All relevant stakeholders will be consulted in this process. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 2.1.4. Develop official GOST-standards (new and revised) or equivalent normative documents for energy efficiency labeling of the selected household appliances and technical building equipment. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 2.2: System of compliance testing and certification  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 2.2.1. Implementing voluntary certification schemes for energy efficiency compliance testing, based on the test procedures (GOST-standards) prepared under activity 2.1.1, compatible with the federal system of compliance certification and registered by the Federal Agency for Technical Regulation and Metrology. The voluntary certification schemes shall be applied by associations of equipment manufacturers and suppliers, under the guidance of the Ministry of Education and Science. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 2.2.2. Reviewing certified test laboratories, in particular ROSTEST laboratories and manufacturers' own manufacturers, and proposing improvements, if necessary. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 2.2.3. Supporting selected certified ROSTEST testing laboratories working with building engineering equipment and appliances; and establishing a test laboratory for household appliance efficiency by OJSC Mosenergosbyt. The laboratory of OJSC Mosenergosbyt will be accredited under the rules of the Federal Agency on Technical Regulation and Metrology, operate on a commercial basis (like ROSTEST laboratories) and focus on the pilot region (Moscow municipality).  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| Output 2.3: Procurement models for energy efficient equipment  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 2.3.1. Develop guidelines, including minimum energy performance standards, for the procurement of technical building equipment and systems (HVAC, industrial air conditioners and fans, pumps), following the technical standards developed under activity 2.1.1 and the energy efficiency labels developed under activity 2.1.3. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| Outcome 3: Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| Output 3.1: Awareness raising, training and technical support for local manufacturers on product and production technologies  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 3.1.1. Carry out a survey among manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment, in order to identify needs for training and technical assistance in energy efficiency product design. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 3.1.2. Carry out a survey among manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment, in order to identify needs for technical assistance in the adaption of production facilities (in combination with activity 3.1.1). |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 3.1.3. Organise training events and provide technical assistance to local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment, focusing on: energy efficient product design, technical standards, equipment testing and cost. Training events and technical assistance will include transfer of experiences with EE S&L programs by foreign and multi-national appliance and equipment manufacturers.  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.1.4. Provide technical assistance to local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment with regard to the adaptation of their production facilities due to the production of new, energy efficient models. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.1.5. Provide technical assistance to local manufacturer with regard to the upgrading of their test laboratories, as necessary. |  | MS | MS | MU | MU |
| Output 3.2: Working group to elaborate public-private partnerships  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 3.2.1. Establish a formal structure of communication and cooperation (working group), including the mentioned private sector participants, the entity in charge of managing the project (Ministry of Education and Science), selected members of the Inter-agency Coordination Body, the "group of adherence" to the program, the Moscow city government and OJSC Mosenergosbyt, and other interested local governments. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.2.2. Elaborate and set up public-private partnerships to promote the adoption of schemes to promote EE S&L and marketing and sales of energy efficient appliances and equipment.  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| Output 3.3: Voluntary agreements on product labeling and incorporation of energy efficiency in the market strategy of manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.3.1. Negotiate with manufactures and distributors of household appliances and technical building equipment voluntary agreements for equipment labeling at sales points and inclusion of energy efficiency information in product documentation. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.3.2. Develop – in cooperation with manufactures, distributors and large commercial buyers of technical building equipment – guidelines for a system of energy efficiency indicators for new buildings, based on the energy efficiency of building construction and the technical systems covered by this project. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 3.4: Public-private partnerships and joint strategies to make energy efficient products more competitive and affordable to the majority of the population  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 3.4.1. Discuss with both local and foreign manufacturers and distributors of household appliances possible product pricing strategies that encourage the purchase of energy efficient equipment by low and middle income consumers. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.4.2. Assist local manufacturers of household appliances and technical building equipment in the elaboration of business plans and marketing strategies for production and marketing of energy efficient products. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 3.4.3. Assist local manufacturers and distributors of household appliances and technical building equipment in the preparation of promotional materials (folders, advertisements, TV-spots, etc.) for energy efficient products, as well as promotional events, e.g. at sales outlets. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 3.4.4. Develop a system of preferential consumer credits (based on the existing consumer credit systems) for energy efficient appliances, in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders, including manufacturers and distributors of appliances and finance institutes. |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 3.4.5. Develop a system of incentives for large commercial buyers, including the use of "Economic development electricity tariffs (EDET)". |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 3.4.6. Preparation of corporate procurement programs with project developers / general contractors for construction projects (residential and commercial buildings), using certified and labelled technical building equipment. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 4.1: Market monitoring mechanism to produce updated information on the sales of the target appliances by energy classes.  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 4.1.1. Finalize the strategy and required software for obtaining, storing and processing the required data at the adequate level of details, including at minimun, the annual sale of different appliances by energy classes and different product categories and sources of origin (local – imported).  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 4.1.2. Conclude agreements with the key private and public sector stakeholders to collect and regularly submit the project with the required data.  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 4.1.3. Process and present the data for monitoring the impact of the adopted policies and voluntary schemes as well as the other promotional activities of the project. |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| Output 4.2: Internet-based information clearinghouse  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 4.2.1. Develop an internet-based portal that provides - in a user friendly way - information on efficiency ratings and other related information on targeted household appliances and technical building equipment. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 4.2.2. Include and regularly update the information presented in the web, in particular energy performance data obtained from certified tests. |  | MS | MU | MU | MU |
| 4.2.3. Promote consumer awareness about the internet-based information clearinghouse (in the framework of the activities under outputs 4.2 and 4.3). Websites of stakeholders should provide links to the information clearinghouse.  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| Output 4.3: Regional awareness campaign for household consumers  |  | MS | MU | MU | MU |
| 4.3.1. Develop, in cooperation with the Government of the Moscow pilot region and Mosenergosbyt, a regional awareness campaign for household consumers, based on market surveys.  |  | MU | MU | MU | MU |
| 4.3.2. Assistance to OJSC Mosenergosbyt in further developing their "Energy Efficiency Consultative Centre" as a customers information centre, exhibiting energy efficient appliances and providing information on energy efficient appliances and practices, including telephone and internet based services. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 4.3.3. Develop didactic material on appliance energy efficiency and energy efficient practices for residential consumers and for students of primary and secondary education. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 4.3.4. Organise information and training events on household energy efficiency for the general public and for students of primary and secondary education, including competitions on energy saving ideas and performance. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 4.3.5. Assist district offices of Mosenergosbyt and sales outlets in setting up consumer information units/desks on energy efficient equipment. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| Output 4.4: Information campaign for large commercial buyers  |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 4.4.1. Carry out market research among large commercial buyers of technical building equipment, in order to identify information needs. |  | MS | MS | MS | MS |
| 4.4.2. Develop, in cooperation with manufacturers and distributors of technical building equipment, technical documentation regarding the energy efficiency characteristics and options of products, focusing on the voluntary EE labeling scheme of the Moscow city government (activity 1.3.2). |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 4.4.3. Organise information and training events for large commercial buyers and their purchasing officers. |  | UA | UA | UA | UA |
| Output 4.5: Trained sales personnel for household appliances and technical building equipment  |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |
| 4.5.1. Provide training on energy efficient products to sales personnel of household appliances and technical building systems. |  | MS | MS | MS | MU |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **\* Status of Delivery:** |  |  |  |  |
| GREEN / COMPLETED | = Indicators show successful achievement |
| YELLOW | = Indicators show expected completion by end of Project |
| RED  | = Indicators show poor achievement - unlikely to be completed by end of Project |

## Finance – Project Expenses Table



## Co-financing and leveraged resources

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co financing(Type/Source)** | **IA own Financing(mill US$)** | **Government****(mill US$)** | **Other\*****(mill US$)** | **Total(mill US$)** | **Total****Disbursement(mill US$)** |
| **Planned \*\*** | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** | **Planned**  | **Actual** |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity investments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|          In-kind support | n/a | n/a | 2.737 | 1.642[[1]](#footnote-1) | 1.216 | 0.730[[2]](#footnote-2) | 3.953 | 2.372 | n/a | n/a |
|          Other types \*\*\* | n/a | n/a | 26.152 | 29.362[[3]](#footnote-3) | 27.266 | 11.633[[4]](#footnote-4) | 53.418 | 40.995 | n/a | n/a |
| **Totals** |  |  | 28.889 | 31.004 | 28.482 | 12.363 | 57.371 | 43.367 |  |  |

## Evaluation TOR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM****TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT** |

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Position Information** |
| Position Title: Type:Project Title/Department: Duration of the service:Duty station:Reports to: | International Consultant/Mid-term EvaluatorIndividual Contract (International)UNDP/GEF Project 00070781 “Standards and Labels for Promoting Energy Efficiency in Russian Federation”25 working days (17 home based, 8 field based), from 18 March to 30 June 2013Home-based with either one x eight days mission to Moscow or two x four days missions to MoscowHead of Environment and Energy Unit, UNDP Russia |

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Background**  |
| **1.** **Standard UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Requirements**The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts based upon indicators; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements to the project (i.e. – adaptive management); iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A combination of tools should be used to ensure effective project M&E. These tools should be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term review, audit reports and independent evaluations. In addition, it is important that there is a UNDP management response to the mid-term evaluation and that recommendations are followed up, discussed, and where appropriate acted upon.In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation period (e.g. four years or more) are required to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access to information during implementation.Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of project objectives outcomes, and to make recommendations regarding specific actions and measures that might be taken to improve the project. The MTE is expected examines the results following on from the project inception workshop and to serve as a means of validating the assumptions in the project design including the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and undertake adaptive management in a prompt manner.This evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy (<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184> ) and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://www.undp.org/gef/monitoring/policies.html> ).**2. Project Background and Overview**The Russian Federation has high levels of energy intensity index and being a rapidly developing economy there is substantial potential for energy saving. During the past several years, the structure of electricity consumption has considerably changed. Following a period of restructuring, with a decrease of energy consumption – mostly due to decline in production - energy consumption has been constantly growing during the past years and is expected to grow further. Some regions of the country – including the capital Moscow and the Moscow area - are already experiencing a shortage of electricity, in particular during peak periods.The structure of electricity consumption has shifted towards higher shares of the residential and municipal sector (27%) and transport (11%). Industrial electricity consumption is still 49%, agriculture 9% and construction 4%. The reasons are structural changes in the country's economy, in particular: (i) growth of housing construction, (ii) development of the services sector – like shopping and entertainment malls and sport complexes, (iii) an expansion of office and hotel construction, (iv) diversification of industry.Specific energy consumption indicators in the industrial, commercial and residential sectors exceed international standards. In the residential and commercial sectors, major electricity saving potentials have been identified in the areas of household appliances, technical building equipment and lighting.A new Federal Law on *Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement* was adopted in November 2009. It provides a number of concrete measures, incentives and mechanisms to promote energy and ecological efficiency in all sectors of the economy. Despite explicit policy statements, the enforcement of these policies is still to be seen and requires a lot of further regulatory work and capacity building. Supplementary regulatory framework, many by-laws and enforcement mechanisms still need to be developed.The implementation of the full-scale UNDP/GEF Project “Standards and Labels for Promoting Energy Efficiency in the Russian Federation” started in June 2010. The project is planned for 5 years. It is nationally executed by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation. The total project budget is $65,181,000 with GEF contribution of $7,810,000.The project objective is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the residential, commercial and public sector in the Russian Federation through the implementation of energy efficiency standards and labelling for key household appliances and technical building equipment, along with complementary measures.The project aims to achieve 4 key outcomes:* Outcome 1. An institutional, legal and regulatory basis established and the capacity of the national authorities built to facilitate introduction and wide-spread application of energy efficiency S&L schemes and their testing at least in one pilot region during the implementation of the project.
* Outcome 2. National S&L schemes for selected power-consuming products are designed and proposed and the verification and enforcement capacity for their implementation based on international best practices built.
* Outcome 3. Enhanced interest and strengthened capacity of the local manufacturers and other supply-chain stakeholders to comply with the new EE standards and to bring energy efficiency models to the market at competitive and for the majority of the population affordable prices.
* Outcome 4. Enhanced awareness and improved access to non-partial information of residential and commercial clients concerning energy efficiency of targeted appliances.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **III. Functions / Key Outputs Expected** |
| **1. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES**This Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) is initiated by the UNDP Russia as the Implementing Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Russia Project Support Office and UNDP-GEF Bratislava Regional Centre) with concrete recommendations aimed at adjusting the projects strategy and activities in order to better achieve the projects overall objectives and outcomes. The mid-term evaluation also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.The mid-term evaluation will play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on: (i) how to adjust activities and outputs in the project in order to better achieve the project objective and outcomes; (ii) how to ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective; (iii) how to enhance organizational and development learning; and (iv) how to enable informed decision – making. The mid-term evaluation should provide to the GEF Secretariat with complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The evaluator should prepare specific ratings on specific aspects of the project, as described in section “Scope of the Evaluation” and ANNEX 3 of this Terms of Reference. Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving the objective and outcomes in the established timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. The evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and provides an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies issues and constraints associated with large international and multi-partner initiatives. Cooperation with other initiatives in the same area will also be evaluated as part of the work. The evaluation should also provide recommendations for strategies, approaches and/or activities to improve the potential of the Project to achieve expected outcomes and meet the objective within the Project timeframe. The evaluation might also make comments on the necessity of the project to be extended and under what conditions. Findings of this mid-term evaluation will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation of the current project phase over the remainder of the lifetime of the project.The purpose of the MTE is:1. To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework, and other related documents;
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project and recommend ways to make the project more effective;
3. To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project and recommend changes, as required;
4. To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
5. To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
6. To assess the sustainability of the project’s interventions;
7. To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management;
8. To assess project relevance to national priorities;
9. To provide guidance for the future project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements;
10. To make recommendations concerning proposed adaptive management requirements for the project over the remainder of the lifetime of the project to improve the results of the project

In particular, this evaluation will assess progress in meeting targets as defined in the project logical framework matrix and identifying any difficulties in project implementation and their causes. Based on this analysis, the mid-term evaluation will then recommend corrective courses of action. Effective action to rectify any identified issues hindering implementation will be a requirement prior to determining whether implementation should proceed.Project performance will be measured based on the indicators defined in the Project’s Logical Framework Matrix (see Annex 2) and as adjusted at the project inception workshop. The project logical framework matrix provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. Success and failure will be determined by the extent to which the project has met or is on track to meet these defined indicators. During the inception period the Logical Framework Matrix was updated, along with a number of indicators which were revised to render more clarity and rigidity to the system. The evaluation should therefore be conducted against the revised project framework matrix and not against the original project logframe matrix.The evaluator is expected to work with key project stakeholders, including UNDP Russia Project Support Office, relevant ministries (Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, etc.), Russian Energy Agency, RosStandard, Moscow Government, private companies, business associations, NGOs, Internet community on energy efficiency.The Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions.**2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**The evaluation should assess the range of aspects described below. The applicable rating criteria are as follows: 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings.2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problemsRatings for **Sustainability** assessment are as follows:4: Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability3: Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks2: Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1: Unlikely (U): severe risks.**Additional ratings** where relevant:N/A: Not ApplicableU/A: Unable to AssessAll ratings given should be properly substantiated and justified. **Project Concept and Design:** The evaluator will review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.**Project Implementation:** The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.**Project outputs, outcomes and impact:** The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, either of beneficial or detrimental character.To determine the level of achievement of project outcomes and objectives following three criteria should be assessed according to the ratings provided above:* ***Relevance*:** Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
* ***Effectiveness*:** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there are any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such a project.
* ***Efficiency*:** Is the project cost effective? Is the project the least cost option? Is the project implementation delayed and if it is, then does that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation will also cover the following aspects:**2.1. Progress towards Results**a. Changes in development conditions: * Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans in accordance with the Federal Law of the Russian Federation #261on *Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement* of 11.11.2009?
* How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results?
* Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in project activities?

b. Measurement of change:Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for energy efficiency in selected domestic appliances and technical building equipment (legal and regulatory frameworks, results of energy efficiency and energy conservation activities, etc.) to the baseline ones.The evaluation should specifically look into:* Adequacy of the level and proposed modes of enforcement of the regulatory and programmatic documents developed within the project for creation of an enabling environment for energy efficiency funded from the national budget;
* Adequacy to the Federal Law of the Russian Federation #261on *Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency Improvement* of 11.11.2009;
* Verification of analysis of Russian legislative framework on energy efficiency and energy saving;
* Adequacy of the developed amendments to the legislative and normative documents;
* Adequacy of the developed national standards (GOST) related to energy efficiency labelling;
* Verification of analysis of monitoring of energy consumption and GHG emissions;
* Verification of analysis and assessment of Russian testing laboratories;
* Adequacy of the developed technical regulations regarding labelling of technical building equipment
* Verification of efficiency of measures undertaken to promote sales of energy efficient products;
* Adequacy of types of appliances that the project has chosen to focus on in terms of their energy savings potential (has the project selected the right appliances to work on?)
* Adequacy of measures focused on raising awareness of manufacturers, distributors and consumers in energy efficiency issues;
* Adequacy and effectiveness of activities implemented to raise awareness of public authorities, investors, designers and constructors in promoting more energy efficient products to the market;
* Verification of training courses delivered to manufacturers, distributors and consumers;
* Adequacy and effectiveness of Project’s web site and promo materials;
* Adequacy of communication and promotion strategy

c. Project strategy:* How and why outcomes (listed as outputs in the project document) and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results?
* Do the changes suggested during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)?
* *Consider alternatives – What alternative strategies could or should the project consider to improve results?*
* *Changes in Project Management* - What impact has the change in project management (Project Manager was changed in December 2011) had on the project strategy and on the progress of the project towards meeting results? Has this lead to improvements?

d. Sustainability:* The extent to which the project has mobilized action by the private sector to produce more energy-efficient appliances and led to substantial energy savings
* The extent to which national standards developed by the project have been adopted and have lead to significant energy savings
* Assess the extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end; commitment of the government to support the initiative beyond the project
* The evaluators may look at factors such as mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies.
* The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability.
* The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:
	+ ***Financial resources:*** *Are public and private sector resources being invested into energy savings appliances as the result of the activities of this project? Is this likely to continue after the project ends?* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?
	+ ***Socio-political:***Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
	+ ***Institutional framework and governance:***Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
	+ ***Environmental:***Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.
* Each sustainability dimension of the project outcomes should be rated as described above in application to Sustainability.

**2.2 Project’s Adaptive Management Framework**a. Monitoring systems* + Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
* Do they provide the necessary information?
* Do they involve key partners?
* Are they efficient?
* Are additional tools required?
	+ Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it.
	+ What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management, if such?
	+ Assess whether or not M&E system facilitates timely tracking of progress towards project’s objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; annual project reports are complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system is used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs.

b. Risk Management* + Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why.
	+ Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
	+ Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems:
* Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System[[5]](#footnote-5) appropriately applied?
* How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project management?
* How did the project deal with the need to change the Project Manager in late 2011? Was this situation effectively managed and did it lead to improvements in the project performance?

c. Work Planning* + Assess the use of routinely updated work plans.
	+ Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
	+ Are work planning processes result-based[[6]](#footnote-6)? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning.

d. Financial management* + Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. (Cost-effectiveness: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.). Any irregularities must be noted.
	+ Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
	+ Did promised public sector co-financing materialize (please fill out the co-financing form provided in Annex 1 after you have performed independent verification on the numbers)?
	+ Did promised private sector co-financing materialize? (please fill out the co-financing form provided in Annex I, especially after you have performed independent verification on the numbers)

e. Reporting * + Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management (including the change of project manager and other adjustments)
	+ Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

f. Delays* + Assess if there were delays in project implementation and what were the reasons.
	+ Did the delay affect the achievement of project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
	+ Discuss if the project is likely to require an extension beyond its planned lifetime of five years and comment on whether this extension should be granted and under what conditions

**2.3** **Contribution of Implementing and Executing Agencies*** Assess the role of UNDP and the Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation against the requirements set out in the UNDP Program and Operations Policies and Procedures[[7]](#footnote-7). Consider:
* Field visits;
* Participation in Steering Committee meetings;
* Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up;
* GEF guidance;
* Operational support.
* Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP Program and Operations Policies and Procedures, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework.
* Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP and the Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation in terms of “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination).
* Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s and Ministry’s soft assistance and support to the project management.

**2.4 Stakeholder participation, partnership strategy** * Assess whether or not and how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary.
* Assess the involvement of the private sector in the project. Is the private sector being engaged appropriately and what further actions could be undertaken in order to enhance cooperation with the private sector
* Does the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, professional and business associations in the implementation and evaluation of project activities?
* Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.
* Evaluate ongoing project partnerships (e.g. – with EBRD and others) and identify opportunities for stronger and or newer partnerships.

**3. METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION APPROACH**The evaluator should seek guidance for his/her work in the following materials, which could be found at www.undp.org/gef:* UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
* UNDP Evaluation Policy kit

It is recommended that the evaluation methodology include the following:* Documentation review (desk study), to include Project Document, Inception Report, annual GEF Project Implementation Reports, Reports of international consultants hired to assist the project, Minutes of the Steering Committee meetings, GEF quarterly project updates (for more details see ANNEX 4);
* Interviews with Project Management Unit and key project stakeholders, including UNDP Russia Project Support Office, relevant ministries (Ministry of Science and Education of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, etc.), Russian Energy Agency, Moscow Government, Rosstandard, Association of engineers on heating, conditioning and heat supply (ABOK), Association of trade companies and manufacturers of household appliances (RATEK), Association of Enterprises of Climate Industry (APIC), private companies, NGOs, Internet community on energy efficiency;
* In-country field visits, if necessary.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of the project.**4. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**The core product of the Mid-Term Evaluation will be the Mid-Term Evaluation Report that will include:* Executive summary;
* Introduction;
* Findings and conclusions in relation to issues to be addressed identified under the *Scope of Evaluation* section of this TOR;
* Recommendations;
* Lessons Learned;
* Annexes.

The draft and final report will be written in the format outlined in ANNEX 1 of this TOR. The expected length of the report is around 50 pages in total. The first draft of the report is expected to be submitted to the UNDP Russia Project Support Office within approximately **3 weeks** (will be agreed upon in the beginning of the consultancy assignment) of the in-country mission for subsequent circulation to the key project stakeholders for comments. Any discrepancies between the interpretations and findings of the evaluator and the key project stakeholders will be explained in an annex to the final report.The report will be submitted in English both electronically and in printed version. The report will be supplemented by rate tables (ANEX 3). |

|  |
| --- |
| **IV. Tentative timeframe** |
| The evaluation mission(s) in Russia will take place in March – June 2013. The total duration of the assignment will be 25 working days during the calendar period of 3,5 months (18 March – 30 June 2013). 8 of these working days should be spent in the Russian Federation. The consultant can choose to propose either one mission of 8 working days or two missions of 4 working days each (1 at the start of the assignment and 1 at the end of the assignment). This should be made clear in the proposal of the consultant.The following tentative timetable is recommended for the evaluation, however, the final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of the consultancy assignment:Desk review, development of methodology 4 days (tentatively during 18-21 March, 2013)In-country field visits, interviews 8 days (tentatively during 25 March – June, 2013)Drafting report 3 days (tentatively during 8 - 10 April, 2013)Draft report circulation 5 days (tentatively during 15-19 April, 2013)Finalization of report 3 days (tentatively during 24-30 April, 2013)Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to the stakeholders and project management. UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within 5 working days (within the calendar period agreed) after receiving the draft. All comments and suggestions (if any) shall be addressed and the report will be considered as the final deliverable as soon it is accepted by UNDP.The final version of the evaluation report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP Russia Project Support Office (Ms. Nataly Olofinskaya, address: 9, Leontyevsky Pereulok, 125009, Moscow, Russian Federation, tel. +7 495 787-21-00; fax +7 495 787-21-01, e-mail: nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org) and to Mr John O’Brien (email: john.obrien@undp.org) no later than **June 30, 2013**.  |
| **Deliverable** | **Timeframe** |
| 1. Desk review, phone interviews, development of methodology, Submission of Workplan (which includes methodology)
 | 4 days |
| 1. Mission(s) to the Russian Federation, including briefings for evaluators by project management and UNDP Project Support Office, in-country field visits, interviews, de-briefings for UNDP CO
 | 8 days |
| 1. Drafting of the evaluation report and submission to UNDP Russia and UNDP BRC
 | 8 days |
| 1. Draft report circulation for comments and other types of feedback mechanisms
 | 3 days |
| 1. Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)
 | 2 days |
|  |  |
| **V. Payment Conditions** |
| This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and international travel costs (in-country travel cost will be covered by the project), accommodation and meal (DSA or per diems in Moscow) and visas costs required to produce the above deliverables. Payment will be released in 3 installments as follows:* First installment (30% of total contract amount) to be made upon achievement of Deliverables 1
* Second installment (30% of total contract amount) following the completion of the first mission to Moscow and the completion of deliverables 2 and 3.
* Third installment (40% of total contract amount) to be paid upon completion of Deliverables 4 and 5.

Payments will be made following timely submission of the respective deliverables and their acceptance by UNDP Russia Project Support Office and UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre. |

|  |
| --- |
| **V. Recruitment Qualifications** |
| The mid-term evaluation will be undertaken by an individual consultant or a team of two external consultants, who will be assisted by a translator/interpreter (when needed) and will receive the support of UNDP Russia Project Support Office and the Project Management Team.The evaluator(s) selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.  |
| **Education:** | Advanced university degree in economics, energy, or related area. Ph.D or equivalent degree in energy saving and/or energy management would be an asset |
| **Experience:** | * Extensive (at least 5 years) experience related to implementation of or advice for projects related to energy-efficiency and/or development of normative acts (standards) (15 points)
* Extensive (at least 5-year) experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation support related to energy efficiency projects; (15 points)
* Experience in working on energy-efficiency projects in the Russian Federation and with Russian laws and/or normative documents related to energy-efficiency would be an asset (15 points)
* Proven track record of undertaking evaluations which includes application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on energy efficiency including having undertaken at least one mid-term or final evaluations of an energy-efficiency project for an international organization in the last 10 years (10 points)
* In-depth knowledge of Russian, EU and/or United States legislation on energy efficiency related to energy efficiency including knowledge of international best practice (5 points)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures (5 points)
* Fluency in Russian (5 points)

Candidates who pass the technical scoring will be asked to submit a full financial proposal. |
| **Language Requirements:** | Excellent English communication and writing skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset |
| **Others:** | Demonstrable analytical skills |

OUTLINE OF MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

1. **Executive summary**
* Brief description of project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
1. **Introduction**
* Project background
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues to be addressed
* The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation
1. **The project and its development context**
* Project start and its duration
* Implementation status
* Problems that the project seeks to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected
1. **Findings and Conclusions**

 ***4.1 Project formulation***

* + - Project relevance
		- Implementation approach
		- Country ownership/Driveness
		- Stakeholder participation
		- Replication approach
		- Cost-effectiveness
		- Sustainability
		- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
		- Management arrangements

 ***4.2 Project implementation***

* + - Project execution (including appropriateness of executing arrangements)
		- Project implementation
		- Project administration
		- Project planning
		- Financial management
		- Monitoring and evaluation
		- Management and coordination
		- Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

 ***4.3 Results***

* + - Attainment of outputs, outcomes and objectives
		- Project’s Impact
		- Prospects for sustainability
1. **Conclusions and recommendations**
* Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
1. **Lessons learned**
* Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance
1. **Annexes**
* Evaluation TOR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used (if any) and summary of results
* Co-financing and leveraged resources (see Table 1 attached)
* Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

## List of persons interviewed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ФИО** | **Организация** |
| Алексей ВикторовичТуликов | * Руководитель департамента развития законодательства в сфере энергетики и инноватики Федерального Государственного Учреждения «Российское Энергетическое Агентство» Министерства энергетики Российской Федерации
* Член Координационного Совета
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Наталья Моржова | * Руководитель департамента Retail&Technology компании GFK
* Член Координационного Совета
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Евгений Геннадиевич Гашо | * Эксперт Федерального Государственного Бюджетного Учреждения «Аналитический центр при Правительстве Российской Федерации»
* Доцент Национального исследовательского университета «Московский энергетический институт» (МЭИ)
* Наблюдатель в Координационном Совете
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Вячеслав Пузаков | * Руководитель направления по развитию бизнеса в сфере энергосбережения и повышения энергоэффективности ООО ЭНСИС Технологии
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Руслан Сосланович Акиев | * Главный специалист департамента технического регулирования негосударственной некоммерческой организации «Национальное объединение строителей» (НОСТРОЙ)
 |
| Дмитрий Михайлович Горевой | * Начальник отдела развития электроэнергетики Департамента государственного регулирования тарифов, инфраструктурных реформ и энергоэффективности Министерства экономического развития Российской Федерации. 1 –я Тверская-Ямская ул., д. 1,3.
 |
| Александр Васильевич Онищук | * Президент Российской Ассоциации торговых компаний и товаропроизводителей электробытовой и компьютерной техники РАТЭК
* Член Координационного Совета
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Антон Геннадиевич Гуськов | * Директор по связям с общественностью Российской Ассоциации торговых компаний и товаропроизводителей электробытовой и компьютерной техники РАТЭК
* Специалист по продвижению ЭЭ оборудования
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Сергей Пайлакович Кюрегян | * Директор департамента энергоэффективности ОАО «Мосэнергосбыт»
* Член Координационного Совета
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Наталья Дмитриевна Евстратова | * Заместитель руководителя центра энергосбережения и энергоэффективного использования нетрадиционных источников энергии в строительстве Государственного Унитарного Предприятия «Научно-исследовательский Институт Московского Строительства» (ГУП НИИМосстрой) при Правительстве Москвы
* Генеральный директор «ООО «Экопарк Фили»
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Григорий Петрович Васильев | * Заместитель председателя Межведомственного экспертного Совета по энергосбережению в строительстве на территории города Москвы при Департаменте градостроительной политики города Москвы
* Председатель секции «Энергоэффективное домостроение» Объединенного научно-технического совета по вопросам градостроительной политики и строительства города Москвы
* Член научно-технического совета департамента топливно-энергетического хозяйства города Москвы
* Член правления саморегулируемой организации строительных и инженерных компаний Некоммерческое Партнерство «Монтаж инженерных систем зданий и сооружений» (НП ИСЗС-Монтаж)
* Член российско-шведской Рабочей группы по энергетике Российско-Шведского наблюдательного комитета по торговле и экономическому сотрудничеству Департамента энергоэффективности, модернизации и развития Топливно-энергетического комплекса Министерства энергетики России
* Член экспертного совета по энергоэффективности в строительстве и промышленности строительных материалов при Министерстве регионального развития Российской Федерации
* Руководитель центра энергосбережения и энергоэффективного использования нетрадиционных источников энергии в строительстве Государственного Унитарного Предприятия «Научно-исследовательский Институт Строительства» (ГУП НИИ Мосстрой) при Правительстве Москвы
* Научный руководитель и председатель совета директоров группы инновационных компаний ОАО «Инсолар Инвест»
* Член Координационного Совета
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Евгений Аркадьевич Зенютич | * Президент Некоммерческого Партнерства - саморегулируемой организации «Союз энергоаудиторов России»
* Директор Научно-Исследовательского Института энергоэффективных технологий Нижегородского государственного технического университета им. Р.Е.Алексеева
* Генеральный директор ООО «Нижегородский инвестиционный центр энергоэффективности»
 |
| Алексей Петрович Антропов | * Зам. директора департамента развития приоритетных направлений науки и технологий Министерства образования и науки РФ
* Национальный директор Проекта
* Председатель Координационного Совета
 |
| Геннадий Александрович Смага | * Главный специалист по стандартам и маркировке
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Дмитрий Николаевич Ершов | * Менеджер проекта
 |
| Елена Александровна Полякова | * Заведующий сектором энергоэффективности Всероссийского научно-исследовательского Института стандартизации и сертификации в машиностроении (ВНИИНМАШ)
* Член рабочей группы
 |
| Александр Лаврентьевич Наумов | * Вице-Президент Некоммерческого партнерства инженеров по отоплению, вентиляции, кондиционированию воздуха, теплоснабжению и строительной теплофизике (АВОК)
* Генеральный директор ООО Научно-производственное объединение «ТЕРМЭК – инженерные системы зданий»
* Руководитель отдела инженерных систем и член Совета Директоров ОАО «Центральный научно-исследовательский и проектно-экспериментальный институт промышленных зданий и сооружений» (ЦНИИПромзданий)

• Заслуженный строитель России* Член Координационного Совета
* Руководитель рабочей группы
 |
| Валерий Иванович Мишучков | * Директор программы по энергосбережению в сфере жилищно-коммунального хозяйства г. Москвы Московского Государственного Университета Управления при Правительстве г. Москвы
* Заместитель Генерального Директора ООО «Интехэнерго МРС»
* Старший научный сотрудник Национального Исследовательского Университета «Московский Энергетический Институт» (МЭИ)
 |
| Александр Владимирович Зажигалкин | * Заместитель руководителя Федерального Агентства по техническому регулированию и метрологии (Росстандарт). Ленинский пр., д.9, каб. 411
 |
| Алексей Леонидович Солдатов | • Менеджер по техническому регулированию ООО «Бош-Сименс Бытовая техника»• Член рабочей группы |

## Unedited reaction from project manager to MTE Final Version

Fables and realities about Russia EE S&L Project

The MTE draft reports contain misunderstandings and confusions which lead to non-justified conclusions. Some of them are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| N | Fable/delusion | Reality |
| 1 | The project is not demonstrating visible results in the development of legislative base | The project during its preparatory stage was at the origin of EE S&L activities in Russia since 2006. Both UNDP and the Ministry of Science and Education were “locomotives” of these activities with significant finance sources brought in. These activities contributed to the elaboration of the EE Law 261 in 2009. Since the project start in 2010 the project experts made significant efforts towards development of the legal and normative basis to introduce EE S&L. In particular Naumov and Tulikov and their colleagues are the authors of the main documents’ drafts submitted to the Government in this regard. |
| 2 | The ProDoc can easily be updated and brought into current Russian context | The existing ProDoc is not ideal of course; neither it is in line with the current Russian context and is full of confusing and misleading elements. Updating of the ProDoc would be helpful provided that the amendment lead to more understandable and feasible tasks. This may be achieved if those amendments are discussed in details with the professional community and not prepared solely by an external individual expert. However this is not an easy and quick exercise. Apparently this will lead to a considerable delay in the project implementation process. However any amendments should be formally approved by the UNDP and the Ministry which is a time consuming procedure. |
| 3 | No visible changes in project management since 2012 | In 2012-2013 the project started a continuous research to assess the reduction of CO2 emissions in Russia which is one of the project’s goals. In 2012 -2013 the Project participated in seminars and conferences much more often than before (2 in 2010-2011 and 11 in 2012-2013).PIR 2012 states that the project management improved since 2012. In 2012 -2013 the project introduced more self-produced formats and templates for project management purposes.UNDP country office has confirmed that the quality of the project deliverables considerably increased since 2012. |
| 4 | Main project results were obtained in 2011 | A simple list of the project results obtained would be enough to understand that this is not true. Among the most important results obtained since the project start are the results obtained in 2012-2013:* Assessment of the CO2 emission reduction for both HHA and TBE;
* A package of legislative and normative document to set up an official register of energy consumption by equipment of different EE classes;
* 5 GOST standards are approved as national standards in 2012 and one of them is in effect in 2013, other 4 will be in effect not later than 01.01.2014;
* Promo actions in 8 shopping centres held, analysed and disseminated;
* Testing laboratories were reviewed and needs for TA identified;
* Information campaign with large commercial buyers was organized and held;
* More legislative documents and normative documents were developed, notably with regard to procurement procedures.
* Agreement with the second pilot region signed and works started in 2013.
 |
| 5 | NICB members, WG members and contractors should act as 3 separate independent conclaves with no connection to one another | This is hardly possible given the fact that the professional community involved in EE S&L issues is rather small. Everyone knows everyone. The Project managed to attract and involve in its activities best Russian experts in the relevant fields. The NICB consists of mainly government partners representatives (Ministries and Moscow city) with no financial interest in the project. Representatives of private companies and business associations could be present at NICB meetings (which are open meetings) in two different roles:- to present their reports to NICB members;- as observers (with no voting rights but with the opportunity to take part in the discussion).The Project WGs are completely informal mechanisms to allow collective technical experts discussion on the project plans and results and to inform the project management on technical subjects. The working groups are not taking any financial decisions over the project. There is no any conflict of interest in involvement of any experts, professional networks or project subcontractors in these technical discussions over the project. Taking into account the technical nature of the project and few sources of expertise on these issues in the market this involvement is quite helpful. |
| 6 | The Project is not working sufficiently with the private sector | This fable is very popular but has no basis. The project is working closely with the private sector through main business associations which regroup dozens of private companies including manufacturers and retailers. Direct independent contacts with the private sector are also in place (Birusa, B/S/H, Mediamarkt, GFK, etc.). Basically most of the project partners with the exception of ministries are from the private sector. |
| 7 | The project team has limited capacity building, PR and communication skills and is no open to criticism | Of course there is always some space to improve. However, organizational capacities, PR and communications are not the project objectives per se but are the tools to obtain results. For the moment no evidences were provided to demonstrate that not achievement of a certain goal resulted from the lack of a certain skill of the project team. Delays and other drawbacks of the project are the results of either poor formulations in the ProDoc, of complicated procedures to implement works or of high level of complexity of the tasks claimed.The project team is open to a constructive criticism from any parties, but not to a cynical hypocritisism which was faced during the MTE. |
| 8 | Training were done only in 2011 and have no effect since that time | A simple review of the works implemented will show that this is not correct. In 2012-13 the project did a lot of training with large commercial buyers for both HHA and TBE under the outputs 4.4. and 4.5.As for training under the output 3.1 done in 2011 it would be a mistake to assume that in 2012-13 there is no more effect of them. The project goal is not just to deliver training courses all through the period of project implementation, but the goal is to:* develop training methodologies and materials;
* deliver first portion of training courses;
* make training methodologies and materials available.

Methodologies and materials were developed and published in 2011 and are available in 2012-13 to any interested parties and therefore continue giving effect, even if no training is organized by the project in 2012-13 on these subjects. |
| 9 | The Project Team is focused on the current tasks and has no strategic vision | Of course large portion of time is dedicated to every day operations and current tasks. But this does not mean that the project team forgets completely the strategic goals. The strategic vision is being constantly discussed between the project team and key experts at the WG meetings, seminars and conferences attended jointly, and also by phone and e-mails. Every year while drafting annual plan the project team turns to strategic vision and discusses the future plans with regard to medium and long term objectives. Each NICB meeting includes a discussion on the strategic vision and adapts the annual plans accordingly. |
| 10 | The core of the project is to develop and introduce voluntary EE S&L schemes and the project does not pay attention to it. | Voluntary EE S&L schemes are developed for the equipment which is not covered by mandatory labels. For the selected HHA mandatory EE S&L are already introduced by the Law 261 and subsequent Government decrees. The project is now in process of identifying kind of HHA for voluntary EE S&L scheme for those kinds of HHA which are not covered by mandatory labeling.As for TBE voluntary EE S&L schemes the project will continue working on it. The project also contributed to the elaboration of mandatory labeling of buildings which is now already approved by the decree of Minregion. |
| 11 | Bringing in long term international adviser will quickly lead to outstanding results | Using experience of international experts may be quite useful and appropriate if the task is correctly formulated and a good candidate is selected. This seems to be reasonable for short term assignments. As for long term international adviser this involvement may not necessarily lead to the expected results because of possible lack of knowledge of Russian legislative and normative basis. Therefore, if the decision is taken, the selection of such a candidate should be carefully done and the scope of work should be discussed within the professional community. At the same time it is clear that among Russian experts there are some who have good knowledge of both Russian and international legislative and normative basis. |
| 12 | Moving to the UNDP building office is quite easy and will improve project implementation | This question had been repeatedly discussed. The Project Team will be more than happy to improve working conditions. However moving to the UNDP building offices will require considerable payments for rent. The project budget does not have financial sources earmarked for the office rent. The surprising thing is that the UNDP approved the ProDoc in 2010 where no office rent expenses were foreseen and now UNDP country office claims significant rent payments from a non-existing budget source. In any case movement to the UNDP building will require budget revision by the UNDP and approval from the National Project Director. |
| 13 | Poor working conditions are the only difficulty in project implementation and no other major difficulties in project implementation exist | Poor working conditions are not the only and not the major difficulty. Other difficulties that seriously affect project implementation are as follows:* UNDP budget spending rules are based on quarterly allocations to the implementing organization with limitation of next payments until the previous quarterly budget is disbursed. This leads to serious constraints in payments to contractors and to delays in project implementation.
* All financial documents, ToRs for business trips, quarterly reports, advance payment requests, financial reports, disbursements claims, annual plans, evaluations sheets, etc., etc. require signature of the National Project Director. This requires sometimes his immediate availability for signature. As far as availability is not guaranteed delays in project implementation process are inevitable.
* Office equipment and software need to be renovated regularly and this is not possible due to the limitations of the project management budget.
* Remuneration of the project team members is defined on individual case by case basis between the National Project Director and UNDP country office. Apparently no consistent remuneration grid exists for the members of the UNDP project teams, nor does the ProDoc have any indication of this. The current level of remuneration is not competitive for Moscow city and should be revised.
* Business mobile phone communication expenses are not compensated and are covered from the team members’ personal sources.
* Work contracts between UNDP country office and project team members have neither social and pension contribution nor medical assurance.
* UNDP procedures for procurement, hiring an expert or order a service are complicated and time consuming which leads to delays in project implementation. Sometimes these procedures are changed retroactively and the Project team has to redevelop documents already done.
* UNDP rules stipulate that maximum budgets for tenders are not indicated in the tender documentation. This leads to considerable confusions among the potential tenderers and to the decrease of interest of tenderers to apply. Therefore the number of tenderers is low and the project selects contractors among a limited number of applicants.
 |
| 14 | The project is not communicating with other interventions, particularly with the EBRD project | In February 2012 before the start of the EBRD EE project the project manager met with the EBRD Team Leader and discussed opportunities for cooperation. The EBRD Team Leader was explained that the UNDP EE S&L Project is interested in collaboration and will consider any request from the EBRD project in terms of 1) co-financing; 2) sharing experience; 3) expert assistance. As far as the EBRD EE Project had a very limited budget (300 th euro) and timeframe, the Team Leader explained that the EBRD EE project is not interested in co-financing from the UNDP side and that it would be happy 1) to receive UNDP EE S&L Project reports on relevant selected subject (notably related to HHA) and 2) if the UNDP EE S&L Project representatives are present at regular meetings of the Steering Group of the EBRD project and take part in the discussions.Both requirements were fulfilled during the period June 2012 – June 2013. |
| 15 | This is quite easy to estimate mathematically the project’s contribution to the reduction of CO2 emissions | The complexity of this task appeared to be much higher than expected. The research carried out by the project in 2012-2013 on the assessment of energy consumption and GHG emissions of HHA and TBE by energy classes was a pioneer work in Russia. There is no statistics on sales of products by energy classes and no methodic for GHG emission reduction assessment. To carry out the research methodology for gathering and processing information was elaborated for both HHA and TBE. On the basis of data on sales of new equipment during the period 2009-2011 the cumulative effect of reduction of energy consumption was assessed to calculate reduction of GHG emissions. This work required expertise of many experts. Finally the reduction GHG emission was received. The project will repeat the calculations and get data for longer period.As for the project’s contribution to this reduction, this is a disputable issue to be discussed among the experts as soon as no methodology exists in this respect and the assessment is done on an expert analysis basis. |
| 16 | Awareness raising and training activities have effect solely during the period of implementation of those activities. | The objective of those activities is to improve knowledge of the target groups and therefore the effect of them cannot be short term. If training was delivered in the second half 2011, that does not mean that there is no effect in 2012 and further on. Firstly, the improved knowledge has effect on the behavior of the target groups in the long term and secondly, training and awareness raising methodologies once developed become available to trainers and are used to train and raise awareness of other target groups. |
| 17 | Training of large commercial buyers and promo actions in shopping centres cannot be considered as awareness raising and training activities | In 2012 the project implemented significant training programs for large commercial buyers of both HHA and TBE. Large number of people was trained and besides that training methodologies and training materials were developed which currently are (and in future will be) used for further training.Promo actions in 8 big shopping centres were organized and held in 2012 focused on awareness raising of consumers. Results were analysed and disseminated. Methodology and recommendation on how organize and held such actions developed and disseminated among Ratek association members. |
| 18 | The Internet based clearing house does not exist in Russia and can be developed by the project | During the period of development of the ProDoc there were no advanced internet sources on EE in Russia and a clearinghouse seemed to be quite actual and important. Currently there are some of them developed with the use of significant public sources. It does not make sense now for the project to repeat was already has been done. Besides that even if the Project starts repeating or developing a new clearing house, this will require significant financial sources far beyond Project budget and will require involvement of a professional web design company with prominent knowledge of EE. This is the case where revision of output and activities are appropriate. |
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47. CD with all project documents
1. Ministry of Science and Education and of Moscow City Government according to the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. AVOK, RATEK and Mosenergosbyt according to the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ministry of Education and Science – 3.132

 Moscow City Fuel and Energy Facility Department (Moscow City Government)- 26.230 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. RATEK – USD 367,000.00

ABOK - USD 11,133,000.00

Mosenergosbyt – USD 133,000.00

  [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP-GEF’s system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XII at http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. RBM Support documents are available at http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Available at <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/project/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)