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UNDP Management Response Template

[***Name of the Evaluation***: **Mid-term evaluation of the** "**Energy Efficiency Standards and Labelling in Jordan”**

Date: August 26th 2013 and September 5th, 2013:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Prepared by***: Mohammad Maaytah | ***Position***: Project Manager | ***Unit/Bureau***: UNDP Jordan / RBAS |
| ***Cleared by:*** *Mohammad Alatoom* | ***Position***: Environment Program Analyst | ***Unit/Bureau***: UNDP/ RBAS |
| ***Input into and update in ERC***: Katia Madanat | ***Position: M&E Associate*** | *Unit/Bureau*: UNDP/RBAS |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1.**  The mid-term evaluator has discussed the methodology to calculate the cumulative indirect CO2 emission reductions that will accrue from the enforcement of MEPS in Jordan using update data and new assumptions. The Grid Emission Factor for Jordan will be used in the calculations. The validity of the calculations should be revised during the Terminal Evaluation of the EESL programme.[PMU and Consultant] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** *The methodology will be modified to incorporate additional levels of detail and advice from the evaluator on how to calculate cumulative emissions.* | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1.1 With guidance from the evaluator, the GHG emission calculations were modified to include more realistic assumptions for all appliances | October 1st 2013 | PMU | Complete for now but will be revisited for the terminal evaluation | Complete |
| 1.2 Companion document has been produced to explain the reasoning behind each individual assumption in the GHG emission calculations | October 3rd 2013 | PMU |  | Complete |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2:**  UNDP and GoJ have to contribute their share of cash co-financing to the programme. Given the current economic and political context, GoJ should contribute at least partially its pledged cash co-financing, while UNDP should commit its full share of co-financing to cover project management costs. This is important for two reasons: (1) to ensure that there is sufficient funding for project management expenses until the end of December 2014 (assuming the 6-month project extension that is recommended by the mid-term evaluation is granted); and (2) so that GEF funding that is used to cover project management costs is kept to within 10% of total GEF funds [UNDP and GoJ] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** UNDP remains committed to its share of the co-financing agreement and will disburse all remaining funds during the 2014 implementation phase. The GoJ has so far committed to its co-financing share and so far part of the money has been transferred to the project. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1. UNDP to allocate remaining funds as part of its commitment to the project for the 2014 calendar year | Jan 2014 – Dec 2014 | UNDP |  | On-going |
| 2.2. UNDP to officially contact GoJ, Ministry of Planning and International Corporation (MOPIC) for the remaining share of the co-financing agreement | Feb 2014 | UNDP, GOJ |  | On-going |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3:**  It is strongly recommended that the PB should meet more regularly (at least every 3-4 months) until the closure of the programme. [PMU, UNDP, MoPIC and NERC] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** The long lag time between PB meetings was to ensure that there are solid deliverables to report on for the meeting. Now that most major deliverables (research consultancies) are completed, the remaining activities are the installation of the labs and the execution of the awareness campaign. Especially for the awareness campaign, it is will indeed be important for the PB to meet – or, if not possible, then the PAC. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 3.1 Invite PB to convene for 2013 and arrange for an early meeting date in 2014. | November 2013, February 2014 | PMU, UNDP, NERC, MOPIC |  | Ongoing |
| 3.2 Invite the PAC for a “progress so far” meeting and arrange for another meeting directly after PB in 2014 | November 2013, March 2014 | PMU, NERC |  | Ongoing |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4:** The management team missed two opportunities to modify the results framework. The two opportunities were: (1) the inception workshop; and (2) late in 2011 when the results framework was reformulated at the level of outputs and validated by the Programme Board. While developing the next AWP, it would be useful for the management team to address this issue. It is also a shortcoming that should not be repeated in future project development. [UNDP and PMU] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** During the inception workshop no issues were flagged which necessitated the modification of the results framework and as such they were not changed. By late 2011, when the project had only been active for less than 4 months: at that point and beyond, the necessity of modifying the results framework had become clear and, consequently, a revision was conducted and approved by the PB and RTA. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 The lesson learnt is that UNDP will use this observation and take it into consideration for the future. | Until end of project | PMU |  | Ongoing |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:**  The PMU should seek to collaborate with RCREEE through MEMR to enhance its delivery. [PMU] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** This was discussed with the evaluator based on the project’s intent to disseminate the results of the consultancies (notably Technical Market Assessment and the Policy Option) to other countries in the region. RCREEE was suggested as a good option since it has relations with many Arab states through their representatives from the respective Ministry of Energy in each country. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 5.1 The IP has a very good working relationship with RCREEE and the Ministry of Energy; as such, once the Technical Market Assessment and Policy Options are given final approval, they will be sent to RCREEE with a request to distribute to all member countries | January 2014 | PMU, NERC |  | Ongoing |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:**  The PMU should seek to collaborate with RCREEE through MEMR to enhance its delivery. [PMU] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** This was discussed with the evaluator based on the project’s intent to disseminate the results of the consultancies (notably Technical Market Assessment and the Policy Option) to other countries in the region. RCREEE was suggested as a good option since it has relations with many Arab states through their representatives from the respective Ministry of Energy in each country. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 5.1 Build upon the good relationship of the IP with RCREEE to initiate a communication line in order to exchange knowledge and share project’s main deliverables with them. | January 2014 | PMU, NERC |  | Ongoing |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6:**  It is recommended that the programme should be extended to 31 December 2014 in order for the programme to maximize its post-project impact. There need not be an increase in funding as long as promised cash co-financing is obtained. [UNDP, MoPIC] | | | | |
| **Management Response:** It is agreed that, to ensure the successful delivery of the washing machine labs, the current end date of June 2014 is very tight. An additional 6 month no-cost extension will give enough time to ensure said delivery. The extension will also allow additional time to carry out the awareness campaign to ensure reaching a larger number of consumers. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 6.1 Based on the recommendation of the evaluator, UNDP Jordan will request the no-cost extension of the project from UNDP-GEF for the purpose of the labs and the awareness campaign | November 2013 | UNDP |  | Ongoing |
| 6.2 This recommendation will be discussed with the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) during the next PB meeting | November 2013 | UNDP, NERC, MOPIC |  | Ongoing |