

UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

To the comments received on 18.07.2015 from the Terminal Evaluation of ('Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Building in Uzbekistan' (UNDP Project ID-4158)

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

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	1	Project Summary Table	The Project Summary Table on p. 6 has the UNDP Project ID (PIMS #4158) labeled as the GEF Project ID (which is really PMIS# 3624). The number labeled the UNDP Project ID (00070640) is actually the UNDP Atlas ID#, so this should also be relabeled.	ID Numbers corrected in Project Summary Table
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	2	Project Summary Table	<p>Not all TE required ratings are included in the report. While this may not seem to be an issue for the TE, it causes issues with the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office's Quality Assessment as they are not able to compare their ratings of the project to the TE's ratings. I recommend that you ask the consultants to revise the ratings to match the required ratings (full list in the ToR). If the additional ratings aren't added, the risk may be a lower UNDP IEO Quality Assessment TE rating on this report. The consultant should also include the rating scales.</p> <p>Note: the evaluators give one rating for "UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/ execution coordination and operational issues", however the TE Guidance states that these should be evaluated and rated separately.</p> <p>Note: the evaluators give one rating for "Effectiveness and Efficiency" but these should be rated separately, despite the fact that the ToR links them together.</p>	Additional categories added to rating matrix and rating scale added.

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	3	p. 33 Relevance	On p. 33 Relevance is rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS), while in the executive summary ratings summary table, Relevance is rated as Relevant (R). Relevance should be rated on the 2 point R/NR scale, so the rating on p. 33 should be corrected to match the one in the executive summary.	rating on p. 33 corrected to match the one in the executive summary.
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	4	p. 35 Sustainability	4. On p. 35 (overall) Sustainability is rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS), while in the executive summary ratings summary table, Sustainability is rated as Likely (L). Sustainability should be rated on the 4 point likeliness scale, so the rating on p. 33 should be corrected to match the one in the executive summary.	rating on p. 35 corrected to match the one in the executive summary.
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	5	general	I also note that some of the ratings seem high with minimal justification (i.e. M&E, quality of execution/ implementation), although you (CO) are best placed to comment on these ratings given your technical knowledge of the project.	Justification has been supplemented. It should be noted that quality of execution / implementation was rated HS by nearly all stakeholders and partners
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	6	Scope and Methodology	The report doesn't indicate the evaluation criteria outlined in the ToR (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.) As a stand-alone document, the TE should elaborate upon this criteria and define it. The evaluators can refer to UNDP and GEF M&E Guidance for criteria definitions.	Definitions of evaluation criteria has been adopted from Guidance on Conducting TE of UNDP supported / GEF Financed Projects and added to Scope and Methodology Section.
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	7	Scope and Methodology	Any possible limitations of the evaluation should be described (e.g. mission restraints, language, time, resources, etc) in the methodology section. Additionally, the principles for ensuring the quality, integrity, and independence of the evaluation should be described.	Limitations and principles for ensuring the quality, integrity, and independence of the evaluation have been added to Scope and Methodology Section
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	8	Purpose of the evaluation	The report should further expand on the objective(s) of the evaluation (i.e. the key objectives of the evaluation should clearly be outlined in relation to the purpose of the evaluation).	Key and complementary objectives of the evaluation have been added to the Purpose of the evaluation section

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	9	Scope and Methodology	The rational/criteria (i.e. sampling approach) for the selection of persons interviewed, sites visited, and other data reviewed should be described. Further-more, the evaluation approach should clearly explain how it yielded answers to the evaluation question and how it achieves the evaluation purposes and objectives.	Further explanations of the sampling approach and evaluation approach have been added to the Scope and Methodology Section
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	10	Project Description and Development Context	The section on the Project Description and Development Context should further describe the relevant national/regional development context in Uzbekistan.	Paragraph on national/re-regional development context in Uzbekistan is added in Problems that the project sought to address section
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	11	Planned Stakeholder Participation	In the Planned Stakeholder Participation section, the evaluator lists the main planned stakeholders, but their (planned and actual) roles and contributions to the project (including in-kind contributions, technical assistance, participation, staff time, training, leadership and advocacy) are not clearly described.	Details of Stakeholder participation added in Planned Stakeholder Participation section
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	12	Efficiency and Effectiveness	The evaluation criteria Efficiency and Effectiveness should be analyzed separately. The Efficiency section should discuss project finance and co-finance. In addition, the consultants should further explain why project co-finance exceeded planned co-finance.	Efficiency and Effectiveness have been analyzed separately. Project finance and co-finance further explained in Efficiency and Effectiveness section.
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	13	Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management	The report briefly addresses how the project team followed up after the Mid-term Review (MTR), however more detail in this regard is expected (i.e. did the project address all the recommendations made by the MTR?)	Discussion on follow-up from MTR has been expanded in section Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	14	Impact	The report's discussion on Impact gives success factors for the project exceeding its targets, but doesn't address what's in the ToR: the evaluators should assess whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.	Discussion on verifiable impact (CO2 emission reductions) has been expanded in Impact Section

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	15	Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons Learned	Because the project has already closed, most recommendations are geared towards future design of projects and reinforcing the initial benefits of the project. The recommendations should be clearly labeled, numbered, and prioritized so they can be addressed systematically in the TE management response. To the extent possible, each recommendation should be "SMART" (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound) and should clearly identify who the recommended implementer is, what the suggested timeframe is, etc.	Recommendations have been numbered and labeled.
UNDP HQ email from 18.7.2015	16	Annexes	In addition to the annexes already included, the following annexes should be added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Evaluation Question Matrix (amend-ed from matrix included in ToR annex) * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form (see attached for form) * Report Clearance Form: (see attached for form) * Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail (see attached for template) * Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF CCM Tracking Tool 	Evaluation Question Matrix, Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form and TE audit trail have been added as annexes. Report Clearance Form and Terminal GEF CCM Tracking Tool shall be added by CO and project team.
UNDP CO Comment in track changes	RB1	Project description and development context / Baseline Indicators established / 3. Weak energy management	The Law doesn't mandate energy audits/surveys of buildings: "Article 13 Energy audit Energy audits shall be carried out to assess the efficiency of energy production and consumption. Compulsorily audited shall be all enterprises, organizations and institutions consuming energy resources in an amount of more than six thousand tons of equivalent fuel per annum or more than one thousand tons of motor fuel. The order and terms for the audits shall be determined by the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan" Above is concentrated on	Noted - wording of sentence has been adjusted accordingly

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

			institutions not buildings/facilities, and this was a reason (gap) that projects was designed to cover/avoid.	
UNDP CO Track changes	RB2	same as above	However, they are specialized in energy auditing industries, not buildings	Noted - wording of sentence has been adjusted accordingly
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO3		This suggestion should be reflected in the recommendation section in the end	Noted – recommendation has been added to Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons Learned/ Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success/Weaknesses
UNDP CO Comment in track changes	M4	Findings/ Project Design/ Formulation/ Assumptions and Risks	In fact, those government programs have been completed (but cut) by the time GEF project was endorsed and started up. They were on-going during development of project concept and PIF. However, construction of public buildings was continued through annual government investment programs that include construction/retrofitting of public buildings (schools, medical facilities (8 demonstrations) and other buildings; e.g. those 10 monitored by project). This allows the project to achieve the targets set up.	Noted - wording of sentence has been adjusted accordingly. Originally the project aimed to reach the 2million m2 target in the education and health care building sector only. Later in the project implementation, it was decided to include urban and rural housing investment programmes to ensure that the 2million m2 target was reached (and surpassed).
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO5	Lessons from other relevant projects	Also Kazakhstan, Armenia and Turkmenistan.	Noted and included
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO6	Replication approach	It is slightly confusing why the project was initiated by the Ministry of Economy, but implement by Gosarchitektstroy. It would be good to add one sentence here explaining the role of both in design and implementation, namely that the Ministry of Economy's role is to steer investment in a particular sector, whereas the	Noted – explanatory sentence added.

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

			Gosstroy is basically the implementing agent for state-funded construction programmes and also policy-making body in the building sector – thus better suited for implementation role.	
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO7	Management arrangements	Please check the wording	Wording corrected
UNDP CO Comment in track changes	M8	Project Implementation/ Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)	The reason was that there is not still competitive environment due to centralized system of government management and lack of private companies/individuals (professionals) that authorized for design, construction, audits, etc. of buildings. Currently, the only authorized design/construction/auditing institutions are able to undertake the task envisaged within the project.	Noted - Wording of sentence has been adjusted accordingly. It should be highlighted that central government management worked to the advantage of the project, enabling the quick implementation of legislative, capacity building and demonstration components.
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO9	Project Finance:	The project should have also been subject to regular financial audit, as per UNDP rules, was this the case? And what were the results?	The Uzbekistan CO has a Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) deferral for the current programmatic cycle (2010-2015), All NIM projects are administered through the UNDP accounting system. In view of this, the project was not subject to regular financial audits as none of the cash transfers were done within the project. In 2015, the CO audit shall be conducted by the Office of Audit and Investigation (OAI) whereby the EEPB project (00057241) falls under review by the OAI. The report has not yet been officially published.

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO10	Project Results/ Overall results (attainment of objectives)	Please provide web-link to the methodology, there are several. I think this one is called GEF-STAP	Web-link provided for methodology and tools Revised Methodology for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Energy Efficiency Projects (Version 1.0) from 2013
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO11	Project Results/ Overall results (attainment of objectives)/ Component 2	What is the status of information system?	The information system to collect, store and analyse data on energy consumption of buildings has been accepted by the Ministries of Health and Public Education and is being steadily introduced within education and healthcare facilities.
UNDP CO Comment in track changes	M12	Findings/ Project Results/ Overall Results/ Component 4 – Pilots	The orientation is a big issue in terms how it fits to the master plans for development of rural settlements and relevant for construction of other type of buildings (public, commercial, residential) adopted by the government. Master plans prescribed by the existing infrastructure (main roads, streets and infrastructure), and changing orientation of a newly construction building is not possible, if it doesn't meet the adopted master plan. Therefore, suggestions on how to implement this requirement of IBD in the real practice will be appreciated.	Solar orientation should already be taken into account in the master plan. International best practice examples of solar communities are readily available. Where the orientation or placement of individual buildings must follow a pre-determined layout, there are still opportunities to adjust window openings and sizes based on solar exposure.
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO13	Findings/ Project Results/ Overall Results/ Component 4 – Pilots	There was international consultant hired (and eventually paid!) specifically for this purpose. It would be good to comment on his performance: did the evaluation team receive and review the reports of this consultant?	the reports and recommendations produced by the consultant found little actual application in the demo buildings. Due to budget and time constraints, the demo buildings (with the exception of the rural house) used standard approved building

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

				layouts developed before the project, with improved insulation, windows and heating systems.
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO14	Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project	It would be good to break the recommendations into 2 parts: recommendation to the Government and recommendation to UNDP. In our management response we'll address the latter.	Done
UNDP RTA Comment in track changes	MO15	Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success	Which of those are worst practices?	Section has been separated into Best Practices and Weaknesses as lessons learned which can be applied to the development of future projects.
Gosarchitectstroy Comment in Letter		Letter from A.R.Tokhtaev, First Deputy Chair of Gosarchitectstroy	The Report reflects all project activities, detailed analysis of achievements/results of the project and contains lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations. Report in term of the volume and content meets the highest requirements and recommended to be completed without comments.	
Ministry of Public Education Comments in Letter		Feedback from Ministry of Public Education - - Attachment 1 to Letter from A.R.Tokhtaev, First Deputy Chair of Gosarchitectstroy	Generally, the Report presents the main findings and conclusions of the implementation of the joint UNDP-GEF and Gosarchitectstroy of Uzbekistan Project "Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan". As stated in the Report, in the framework of the project, two new schools in rural areas have been built and general reconstruction of four existing schools buildings located in different climatic zones of the country has been carried out. The results of the energy monitoring for the sites showed a significant reduction in energy consumption, while maintaining a stable comfortable indoor temperature, improving comfort, reducing the incidence of sickness in students and teachers in	Noted – sentence on additional benefits to students and teachers in terms of comfort, health and productivity added to Project Results – Component 4 – demonstration buildings.

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

			the winter period, and as a result, improving of learning progress. This fact should be reflected in the report and it should be recommended further mandatory application of energy-saving, energy-efficient solutions and measures when construction and reconstruction of educational institutions in strict adherence with the revised building codes.	
Ministry of Health Comments in Letter		Feedback from Ministry of Health - Attachment 2 to Letter from A.R.Tokhtaev, First Deputy Chair of Gos-architectstroy	<p>Having considered the Report submitted, we would like to highlight the following:</p> <p>During the project implementation, in accordance with the request of the Deputy Minister of Health (Letter of MH №09-эп-3/15 d/d 31.01.2013) in two rural health demonstration clinics located in Navoi and Tashkent regions the system of energy management and information system for the collection, storage and analysis of data on energy consumption of buildings was tested, and monthly monitoring of works was carried out by the Ministry. The results of testing systems have shown to be highly effective and in accordance with the decisions of Navoi (Letter № 8/01-1159 d/d 01.08.2013) and Tashkent (letter №05-19, 01/1244 d/d 23.07.2013) Regional health authorities these systems are implemented for testing in all health facilities.</p> <p>Through a series of educational programs and courses, workshops and trainings, the project created enabling environment for the testing and implementation of these systems. Nevertheless, it is obvious that further up-scaling of these systems throughout the country requires additional efforts in the field of capacity building of local specialists, improvement of infrastructure, new software products, etc. This work requires much more time and efforts. In general, we consider that the joint project has carried out all the tasks in the development and testing of</p>	<p>Progress in activities related to building energy management have been elaborated.</p> <p>Paragraph on energy management demonstration in 2 rural health clinics added to Project Results – Component 2 - Building energy management, audit, certification and labeling.</p> <p>Additional time, capacity building and infrastructure requirements have been noted in section Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project - Point 3 Implementation of building energy management, energy audit and certification schemes.</p>

Annex J – Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail

			systems for energy management in buildings for period of its implementation.	

Office ACE-Group

From: Rano Baykhanova [rano.baykhanova@undp.org]
Sent: Samstag, 18. Juli 2015 13:17
To: Office ACE-Group; shulginata@yahoo.com
Cc: Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov; Kakhramon Usmanov
Subject: Comments to draft TE Report received from HQs
Attachments: UNDP-GEF-TE Evaluation Question Matrix_English.docx; UNDP-GEF-TE Report Clearance Form_English.docx; UNEG Code of Conduct Form for TE.docx; UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail Template_English.docx

Importance: High

Dear Adil,

We have received comments from UNDP HQs and consider that you need to start addressing them now while we collect comments from CO and RTA as well as the key national partners to stick into the deadlines indicated in TOR.

They are as follows:

Thank you for sending this TE for PIMS #4158 Uzbekistan for review. Overall, the report has some components of a strong TE, but it can still use some work from an evaluation perspective and have the following comments and recommendations:

1. The Project Summary Table on p. 6 has the UNDP Project ID (PIMS #4158) labeled as the GEF Project ID (which is really PMIS# 3624). The number labeled the UNDP Project ID (00070640) is actually the UNDP Atlas ID#, so this should also be relabeled.
2. Not all TE required ratings are included in the report. While this may not seem to be an issue for the TE, it causes issues with the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office's Quality Assessment as they are not able to compare their ratings of the project to the TE's ratings. I recommend that you ask the consultants to revise the ratings to match the required ratings (full list in the ToR). If the additional ratings aren't added, the risk may be a lower UNDP IEO Quality Assessment TE rating on this report. The consultant should also include the rating scales. The additional required ratings for this TE include:
 - * Monitoring and Evaluation
 - * M&E design at entry
 - * M&E Plan Implementation
 - *
 - * IA & EA Execution
 - * Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)
 - * Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)
 - * Overall quality of Implementation / Execution
 - * Note: the evaluators give one rating for "UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/ execution coordination and operational issues", however the TE Guidance states that these should be evaluated and rated separately.
 - * Sustainability
 - * Financial resources
 - * Socio-political
 - * Institutional framework and governance
 - * Environmental
 - *
 - * Note: the evaluators give one rating for "Effectiveness and Efficiency" but these should be rated separately,

despite the fact that the ToR links them together.

3. On p. 33 Relevance is rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS), while in the executive summary ratings summary table, Relevance is rated as Relevant (R). Relevance should be rated on the 2 point R/NR scale, so the rating on p. 33 should be corrected to match the one in the executive summary.

4. On p. 35 (overall) Sustainability is rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS), while in the executive summary ratings summary table, Sustainability is rated as Likely (L). Sustainability should be rated on the 4 point likeliness scale, so the rating on p. 33 should be corrected to match the one in the executive summary.

5. I also note that some of the ratings seem high with minimal justification (i.e. M&E, quality of execution/implementation), although you are best placed to comment on these ratings given your technical knowledge of the project.

6. The report doesn't indicate the evaluation criteria outlined in the ToR (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.) As a stand-alone document, the TE should elaborate upon this criteria and define it. The evaluators can refer to UNDP and GEF M&E Guidance for criteria definitions.

7. Any possible limitations of the evaluation should be described (e.g. mission restraints, language, time, resources, etc) in the methodology section. Additionally, the principles for ensuring the quality, integrity, and independence of the evaluation should be described.

8. The report should further expand on the objective(s) of the evaluation (i.e. the key objectives of the evaluation should clearly be outlined in relation to the purpose of the evaluation).

9. The rational/criteria (i.e. sampling approach) for the selection of persons interviewed, sites visited, and other data reviewed should be described. Furthermore, the evaluation approach should clearly explain how it yielded answers to the evaluation question and how it achieves the evaluation purposes and objectives.

10. The section on the Project Description and Development Context should further describe the relevant national/regional development context in Uzbekistan.

11. In the Planned Stakeholder Participation section, the evaluator lists the main planned stakeholders, but their (planned and actual) roles and contributions to the project (including in-kind contributions, technical assistance, participation, staff time, training, leadership and advocacy) are not clearly described.

12. The evaluation criteria Efficiency and Effectiveness should be analyzed separately. The Efficiency section should discuss project finance and co-finance. In addition, the consultants should further explain why project co-finance exceeded planned co-finance.

13. The report briefly addresses how the project team followed up after the Mid-term Review (MTR), however more detail in this regard is expected (i.e. did the project address all the recommendations made by the MTR?)

14. The report's discussion on Impact gives success factors for the project exceeding its targets, but doesn't address what's in the ToR: the evaluators should assess whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

15. Because the project has already closed, most recommendations are geared towards future design of projects and reinforcing the initial benefits of the project. The recommendations should be clearly labeled, numbered, and prioritized so they can be addressed systematically in the TE management response. To the extent possible, each recommendation should be "SMART" (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound) and should clearly identify who the recommended implementer is, what the suggested timeframe is, etc.

16. In addition to the annexes already included, the following annexes should be added:

- * Evaluation Question Matrix (amended from matrix included in ToR annex)
- * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form (see attached for form)
- * Report Clearance Form: (see attached for form)
- * Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail (see attached for template)
- * Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF CCM Tracking Tool

Annexes requested are attached (but some of them are in TOR), but Terminal GEF CCM Tracking Toll will be provided shortly by Kakhramon.

CO, RTA and national partners' comments will be provided during the week by 22 July or so.

Best regards,

Rano



100011, Toshkent sh., Abay ko'chasi, 6
tel. 244-15-95, faks: 244-05-76
web: davarh.uz

100011, г. Ташкент, ул. Абая, 6
тел. 244-15-95, факс: 244-05-76
e-mail: info@davarh.uz

№ 4359/11-03

"29" 07 20 15

**Представительство ПРООН
в Узбекистане**

Кас. отзйвов к отчету о заключительной оценке деятельности совместного проекта Госархитектстроая РУз, ПРООН и ГЭФ

Комитет рассмотрел представленный отчет по заключительной оценке совместного проекта Госархитектстроая РУз, ПРООН и ГЭФ «Повышение энергоэффективности объектов социального назначения в Узбекистане», подготовленный независимым международным экспертом Адылом Лари. Целью подготовки данного отчета являлось представление независимой оценки деятельности, достижениям проекта, а также извлеченных уроков, полученных в результате реализации проекта.

В отчете отражена вся деятельность проекта, подробно проанализированы достижения/результаты проекта, а также представлены извлеченные уроки, выводы и рекомендации.

Общая оценка деятельности проекта в целом выставлена на уровне «Весьма удовлетворительно».

Отчет по объему и содержанию соответствует высоким требованиям и рекомендуется оформлению без замечаний.

Отзывы министерств народного образования и здравоохранения РУз к заключительной оценке деятельности проекта прилагаются.

Приложение:

Отзйвы МНО и МЗ РУз на 2 стр.

Первый заместитель председателя

А.Р. Тохтаев

**UNDP Country Office
in Uzbekistan**

Subject: feedbacks to Terminal Evaluation Report of joint UNDP/GEF and Gosarchitectstroy Project “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Building in Uzbekistan”

The Committee considered the Terminal Evaluation Report of joint UNDP/GEF and Gosarchitectstroy Project “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Building in Uzbekistan”, made by Mr. Adil Lari - Independent International Evaluator. The purpose of the Report was to present an independent evaluation of project activities, achievements and lessons learned.

The Report reflects all project activities, detailed analysis of achievements/results of the project and contains lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations.

Overall rating for the project activities is given as “Highly satisfactory”

Report in term of the volume and content meets the highest requirements and recommended to be completed without comments.

Feedbacks from the Ministry of Public Education and the Ministry of Health of Uzbekistan to the final evaluation of the project are attached.

Attachments:

Feedbacks of the Ministry of Public Education and the Ministry of Health - 2 pages

First Deputy of Chair of Gosarchitectstroy

A.R Tokhtaev

Отзывы

Министерства народного образования РУз к отчету по заключительной оценке совместного проекта Госархитектстроя РУз, ПРООН и ГЭФ «Повышение энергоэффективности объектов социального назначения в Узбекистане»

В целом, отчет отражает основные результаты и выводы от реализации совместного проекта ПРООН-ГЭФ и Госархитектстроя РУз «Повышение энергоэффективности объектов социального назначения в Узбекистане». Как изложено в отчете, в рамках реализации данного проекта, были построены две новые сельские школы, а также проведена капитальная реконструкция четырех существующих типовых школ, расположенных в разных климатических зонах страны. Результаты энергетического мониторинга объектов показали значительное снижение энергопотребления при сохранении стабильной комфортной температуры внутри помещений, повышения уровня комфортности, снижение уровня заболеваемости учащихся и преподавателей в зимний период, и вследствие, повышения успеваемости предметов. Данный факт необходимо отразить в отчете, и рекомендовать дальнейшее обязательное применение энергосберегающих, энергоэффективных решений и мер при строительстве и реконструкции образовательных учреждений в строгом соответствии с пересмотренными строительными нормами и правилами.

**Feedback
of the Ministry of Public Education to the Terminal Evaluation Report of joint
UNDP/GEF and Gosarchitectstroy Project “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public
Building in Uzbekistan”**

Generally, the Report presents the main findings and conclusions of the implementation of the joint UNDP-GEF and Gosarchitectstroy of Uzbekistan Project “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Uzbekistan”. As stated in the Report, in the framework of the project, two new schools in rural areas have been built and general reconstruction of four existing schools buildings located in different climatic zones of the country has been carried out. The results of the energy monitoring for the sites showed a significant reduction in energy consumption, while maintaining a stable comfortable indoor temperature, improving comfort, reducing the incidence in students and teachers in the winter period, and as a result, improving of learning progress. This fact should be reflected in the report and it should be recommended further mandatory application of energy-saving, energy-efficient solutions and measures when construction and reconstruction of educational institutions in strict adherence with the revised building codes.

Отзывы

Министерства здравоохранения РУз к отчету по заключительной оценке совместного проекта Госархитектстроя РУз, ПРООН и ГЭФ «Повышение энергоэффективности объектов социального назначения в Узбекистане»

К сожалению, краткая версия отчета не отражает детальную оценку всех направлений деятельности проекта. Следовательно, просим отправить полную версию отчета на русском языке для изучения и представления отзывов.

Изучив представленный отчет, хотелось бы отметить следующее:

В период реализации проекта, в соответствии с поручением Заместителя министра здравоохранения (письмо Минздрав № 09-эр-3/15 от 31.01.2013г.) в двух демонстрационных сельских врачебных пунктах, находящихся в Навоийской и Ташкентской областях республики, были апробированы система энергоменеджмента и информационная система по сбору, хранению и анализу данных по энергопотреблению зданий, и установлен ежемесячный мониторинг выполнения работ со стороны министерства. Результаты апробации систем показали свою высокую эффективность и в соответствии с решениями областных управлений здравоохранения Навоийской (письмо № 8/01-1159 от 01.08.2013г.) и Ташкентской (письмо №05-19,01/1244 от 23.07.2013г.) областей, данные системы внедрены для апробации на всех объектах здравоохранения.

Посредством проведения ряда образовательных программ и курсов, семинаров и тренингов, проектом была подготовлена благоприятная среда для апробации и внедрения этих систем. Тем не менее, очевидно ясно, что дальнейшее широкомасштабное применение данных систем по всей республике требует дополнительных усилий в области наращивания потенциала местных специалистов, усовершенствования материально-технической базы, новых продуктов программного обеспечения и т.д. Данная работа требует значительно большего периода времени и усилий. В целом, считаем, что совместный проект, в сроки своей реализации, выполнил все поставленные задачи в области разработки и апробации систем по энергоменеджменту зданий.

**Feedback of
the Ministry of Health to the Terminal Evaluation Report of joint UNDP/GEF and
Gosarchitectstroy Project “Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Building in
Uzbekistan”**

Unfortunately a short version of the Report did not reflect detailed evaluation of all directions of the project activities. Therefore we ask to send full version of the Report for study and review.

Having considered the Report submitted, we would like to highlight the following:

During the project implementation, in accordance with the request of the Deputy Minister of Health (Letter of MH №09-эп-3/15 d/d 31.01.2013) in two rural health demonstration clinics located in Navoi and Tashkent regions the system of energy management and information system for the collection, storage and analysis of data on energy consumption of buildings was tested, and monthly monitoring of works was carried out by the Ministry. The results of testing systems have shown to be highly effective and in accordance with the decisions of Navoi (Letter № 8/01-1159 d/d 01.08.2013) and Tashkent (letter №05-19, 01/1244 d/d 23.07.2013) Regional health authorities these systems are implemented for testing in the all health facilities.

Through a series of educational programs and courses, workshops and trainings, the project created enabling environment for the testing and implementation of these systems. Nevertheless, it is obvious that further up-scaling of these systems throughout the country requires additional efforts in the field of capacity building of local specialists, improvement of infrastructure, new software products, etc. This work requires much more time and efforts. In general, we consider that the joint project has carried out all the tasks in the development and testing of systems for energy management in buildings for period of its implementation.