

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	2107
IA/EA Project ID	2426
Focal Area	Climate Change
Project Name	Removing Barriers to Energy Efficiency Improvements in the State Sector in Belarus
Country/Countries	Belarus
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNDP
Executing Agencies involved	Committee on Energy Efficiency and the Council of Ministers of Belarus
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 5: Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation
TER Prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Kumar Negi
Author of TE	J.N. Ketting
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	27/03/2006
Project Implementation Start Date	18/12/2006
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	01/12/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	31/12/2011
TE Completion Date	27/11/2011
IA Review Date	N/A
TE Submission Date	11/12/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant		
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	-	-
GEF Financing	1.40	1.40
IA/EA own		
Government	3.15	N/A
Other*	5.22	N/A
Total Project Financing	9.77	
Total Financing including Prep	9.77	

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	MS	S	MS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MU	MU	MU
Monitoring and Evaluation	MS	S	N/A	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	MS	N/A	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

4. Project Objectives

4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the project appraisal document, the project's overall objective is "the reduction of GHG emissions by removing the major barriers to the development of a market for energy-efficient products and services to reduce and offset fossil fuel use in Belarus".

No changes to the Global Environmental Objectives of the project were noted in the Terminal Evaluation or in the final PIR.

4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

According to the project appraisal document, the project objective is "to increase internal investment in energy efficiency projects in the state sector through targeted assistance in the areas of application of energy norms to energy planning, introduction of staff incentives and settlement account for accruing of energy savings, improving audit standards, increasing the share of loan funds over grants in energy efficiency financing".

The expected impact of the project is "to reduce greenhouse gas emissions directly by approximately 0.35 million tons of CO₂ equivalent over 15 years by catalyzing investments in energy efficiency in the state sector of Belarus of no less than USD 8 million, including USD 2.9 million from the Committee on Energy Efficiency".

The following immediate outcomes of the project are listed in the project appraisal:

- (1) Increased incentives for state organizations to invest in energy efficiency
- (2) Financial resources made available by the state sector for energy efficiency investment are used more efficiently
- (3) Project successes sustained and replicated throughout Belarus

The Mid Term Project Evaluation completed in August 2009 showed that during the course of the project's implementation, deviations from its budget, planning, and delivery of results

occurred. An important revision of the Project Document Logframe was taken up to remedy to the shortcomings and eliminate inconsistencies. Some outputs and respective targets were improved to bring them in line with the changed circumstances in Belarus. The following outputs were removed from the revised Logframe:

output 1.1. Budget organizations use energy norms in estimating their annual budget,

output 1.2. Budget organizations deposit their energy savings into settlement accounts,

output 1.3. Budget organizations issue incentives to staff responsible for increasing their investments in energy efficiency,

output 2.2. Increase the portion of loans compared to grants, offered by the state for energy efficiency,

output 2.4. USD 8 million in new cost effective energy efficiency investments secured.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	Yes	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious
Other activities	Yes	The scope of the project activities were reduced due to a lack of progress

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance – Satisfactory*

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the relevance of the project is Moderately Satisfactory.

The project and its outputs and outcomes are consistent with national Belarus EE policies and priorities and address the needs of intended beneficiaries. It is also consistent with the GEF Operational Program 5: “Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation” and GEF Strategic Priority 2: “Increasing Access to Local Sources of Financing”. The major shortcoming is the difference between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries.

Because of the time that passed between the conception and design of the project on one hand and the execution of the project on the other hand project design did not correspond to the change in legislative and economic conditions in which the project was embedded. This problem was partly remedied by the Mid Term Evaluation and the resulting changes proposed and implemented in 2010.

Responsiveness from UNDP to changing and emerging development priorities and needs was satisfactory once the problems in the project were recognized, although the problems could have been recognized in an earlier stage.

5.2. *Effectiveness – Moderately Satisfactory*

The Terminal Evaluation report rates the effectiveness of the project as moderately satisfactory.

The project's intended results (outputs and outcomes) have been largely achieved with most of the progress coming during Phase 2 of the project, after the revision suggested by the Mid Term Evaluation. The project's activities were to a large extent causal in effecting the positive changes as described in the evaluation Logframe. Most of the observed changes can be attributed in some cases to a large extent and in other cases to a lesser extent to the project activities and outputs.

None of the three outcomes have been fully realized, however the project contributed in a meaningful way to its primary objective to increase internal investments in EE projects in the state sector. The GEF funding helped to leverage approximately US\$22 million in investments in EE from loan funds and owners' equity, which significantly exceeds the target of US\$8 million established in the project document.

The project addressed the legal and regulatory barriers for state organizations and other internal investors to invest in EE of the state sector. A number of the regulatory documents were drafted by the project and six of these documents were adopted by the government. However, the project was not capable of reducing or eliminating these barriers because of legislative and economic reasons outside of the project's control.

The International Energy Centre was established as a self-supporting consulting and/or engineering institution. It performs as a hybrid, providing consulting services for the Energy Efficiency Department and other stakeholders. The IEC will administer the NEEP in cooperation with the Department and UNDP.

The project obtained good results in the capacity building area, through trainings, seminars and presentations at conferences.

The project also over-performed in PR and public awareness related activities (this also pertains to the period of the extension of the project).

Project management and PMU team performance left much to be desired up to the extension period but after June 2010, under the new project manager the PMU in its entirety appears to have functioned in an exemplary manner.

The project has met its targets in the area of GHG emission reductions.

The only area where the project could and should have done better is in the establishment of the NEEP internet platform. The NEEP should have been crucial in securing the sustainability of the projects activities. There are virtually no results achieved related to the NEEP.

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Satisfactory**

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, "the ratio of budget versus outputs and results appears to be cost effective". Therefore, the overall assessment of the cost-effectiveness is Satisfactory.

The resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) were converted to results rather efficiently in the period between June 2010 and December 2011. Before that time the use of resources was not always appropriate and economical in producing the desired outputs. When evaluating the total UNDP investment in the project (all projects and soft assistance) toward a given development outcome then the efficiency of the resources employed is satisfactory. If from the start of the project the partnership strategy would have received more attention, then the efficiency of the project could have increased as a result of cost-sharing measures and complementary activities.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Medium/Significant Risks**

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the project design lacked a sustainability strategy and the capacity development of key national stakeholders will need attention in order to increase the sustainability of the project.

Moreover, sustainability of the capacity built depends to a large degree on the EED's true activities and on whether the NEEP will be established or not. The NEEP internet platform is crucial in securing the sustainability of the projects activities. There are currently no results achieved related to the NEEP despite the budget spent on activities related.

The Project in cooperation with the IEC is currently creating a pipeline of EE projects for implementation after project closure. This new EE Investment Program for the EE Department includes, as of Oct 15 2011, at least 25 sites. About USD 120 million of investments to be allocated to this Program have been already committed as loans by one of the IEC's shareholders.

According to the Terminal Evaluation "it is desirable to develop financial and economic mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the assistance ends." To secure the project sustainability, special attention should be paid to keeping the information developed and accumulated during the project updated and accessible to a wide audience. Special attention should be given to the long-term sustainability of the IEC by increasing its range of activities. Its public role should also be enhanced. The challenge is to further disseminate the project results and to create and capture the benefits of the materials and approaches

developed by the project. If nothing more is done, the information accumulated during the project will become outdated, inaccessible and unfit for further use within a matter of months.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. Co-financing

- 6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Financial management of the project has been effective and prudent over the entire duration of the project. According to the project document, co-financing should have been critical for the achievement of GEF objectives. And the activities supported were planned on being well integrated in the project especially the activity consisting of building a portfolio of energy saving projects with a high potential for replication by the Committee on Energy Efficiency

The Terminal Evaluation report states that "a relatively large portion of the project budget has been spent on the Energy Center in comparison with the other outputs of the project".

- 6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Unable to assess because information on actual co-financing was unavailable in the Terminal Evaluation.

6.2. Delays

- 6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

In this project, there were substantial delays due to the lack of equipment in the chosen offices (lack of telephone and internet connections). 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 would have increased effectiveness and budget efficiency.

Moreover, as a response to the Mid Term Evaluation conducted in 2009-2010, the project logical framework was revised and the implementation was extended until December 2011.

6.3. Country ownership

- 6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership appears relatively strong in the case of the removal of Energy Efficiency improvements barriers. The Terminal Evaluation notes that in the 1990s the Government of the Republic of Belarus already implemented measures to reduce the country's energy intensity. In spite of these measures, the level of energy efficiency in Belarus was still lower than in other industrialized countries with a similar climate.

Moreover, the state sector in Belarus represents 68% of the country's total energy and fuel consumption. That is why the Government had a demand to investigate new policy measures in order to increase energy efficiency in the state sector, including effective financing mechanisms.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry - *Satisfactory*

Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry is rated as Satisfactory. Following the Project Appraisal, monitoring and evaluation was conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office with support from UNDP/GEF.

The Project Manager and key experts continuously reported to UNDP and Project Director on the progress achieved during the meetings of the Project Steering Committee, to be established at the beginning of the project. The Steering Committee was composed of the representatives of key project partner organizations. Its meetings (at least once every 6 months) was to make recommendations and suggestions on points to be improved and change the directions of the project if necessary in order to ensure better coordination and complementarity of activities with other related initiatives in Belarus. Other major tools for monitoring included the continuous update of the work plan, field visits, quarterly operational reports to GEF, annual project reports, financial audit and a Tripartite Review Meeting at the end of the project.

7.2. M&E implementation - *Satisfactory*

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, the assessment of the Monitoring and evaluation component of the implementation approach is Satisfactory.

During the extension of the project the results have been well documented. Many materials were well produced and published. This allowed for adequate monitoring and evaluation.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – *Moderately Satisfactory*

8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation – *Moderately Unsatisfactory*

The quality of the implementation of the project is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory because of the following shortcomings:

- (1) Financial management of the project has been effective and prudent over the entire duration of the project. However, a relatively large portion of the project budget has been spent on the Energy Center in comparison with the other outputs of the project.
- (2) The Steering Committee did not include representatives of the owners, the beneficiaries and suppliers of the technical services.
- (3) The Steering Committee was set up as to constitute a group that fulfills the stakeholder participation function, but during the period from July 2010 till December 2011 only 2 Steering Committee meetings were held. According to the TE, a higher frequency of the SC meetings would have resulted in an increased level of stakeholder participation. It would also have been beneficial if changes to the composition of the SC could have been made during the project in accordance with the interest of the stakeholders.
- (4) Finally, confusion and inconsistencies in used terminology in the Logframe during the conception of the project design led to problems and confusion during the project implementation.

8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The shortcomings reported in the quality of Execution are as follow:

- (1) The project management and PMU team performance was weak during Phase I of the project under the leadership of the initial Project Manager and in the period where the Project Manager position was vacant but after June 2010, under the new project manager the PMU appears to have functioned in an exemplary manner.
- (2) The different actors in the project (Executing Agency, Project Steering Committee, PMU, Energy Center and stakeholders/beneficiaries) could have interacted more effectively and intensively. During the extension of the project stakeholders were involved more closely in the project but they met rarely and did not communicate directly about the project.
- (3) Because of the time that passed between the conception and design of the project on one hand and the execution of the project on the other hand project design did not correspond to the change in legislative and economic conditions in Belarus in which the project was embedded. This problem was partly remedied by the MTE and the resulting changes proposed and implemented in 2010.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Highly Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report presents a strong and detailed assessment of the project outcomes and impacts. It is presented in an easy to read table in the Annex per outcome and objectives. A detailed result assessment per pilot sites is also presented. Each assessment is supported by evidences and justified.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Moderately Satisfactory	The report is consistent and the evidence complete. However, some ratings are missing and some explanations are very "light". The country ownership is not described in details, the quality of implementation and execution is not assessed with a lot of evidences, the ratings for each component are justified but supporting explanations are missing.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Moderately Satisfactory	Sustainability of the project is assessed, however as explained in the previous section, supporting explanations are not detailed enough.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Highly Satisfactory	The lessons learned are presented with a lot of support. The assessment is very clear and comprehensive.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Moderately Satisfactory	The report includes some cost analysis of budget expenditures. However the detailed cost assessment and the actual co-financing used is not described. The actual co-financing and the way it has been used among activities is not presented in the report.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Moderately Unsatisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report does not include an assessment of the quality of M&E plan at entry, and the assessment made about the M&E system used during implementation is very short, and lacks information and supporting details. The information generated from this system is not reported.

10. Other issues to follow up on

11. Sources of information

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The Project conducted analytical studies and reviews of existing regulations and practice in the field of EE improvement (e.g. for the EurAsEC Anti-Crisis Fund and EE Department).

Guidelines were prepared and disseminated. They summarized analytical part in a form of manual, which guided the Belarusian EE business community through the generic EE business framework proposed. They focused in particular on identifying and managing cost-effective EE investments, business planning, developing feasibility studies and preparing bankable proposals and loan applications that help mobilize co-financing from banks and other investors.

In addition, guidelines on energy auditing and energy planning in the state sector based on internationally recognized practices and standards were developed and published.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

On the basis of the analytical studies being conducted during the project, several regulatory documents have been adopted or accepted for further conciliation procedure, and some more normative acts or recommendations are currently under elaboration.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

According to the Terminal Evaluation report "*the project over-performed in PR and public awareness related activities (this also pertains to the period of the extension of the project) and it was clearly a good idea of the project to hire a PR manager*".

A web-oriented National EE Platform was supposed to be implemented where technology, finance, legislation, projects and stakeholders would come together. The conceptual design and info-logical structure have been elaborated and standard software tools are available. Several specific instruments like a model for calculations of hydraulic conditions of heat networks and heat losses in heat network are to be developed.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

The Project Manager prepared a Lessons Learned report to showcase the lessons learned by this project.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Capacity building was realized through trainings, seminars and presentations at conferences. The Project conducted four 5-day trainings on energy audit and energy management and prepared a tutorial. The project organized and held four international conferences, one local seminar, three roundtables and participated (or provided participation of Belarusian specialists) in ten different conferences abroad. The Project Team prepared 8 presentations in 6 international conferences abroad and about 50 original articles in Belarusian and Russian mass-media, 7 press-releases, three brochures, two training CDs, and conducted two press-conferences. The Project organized four Republican Contests on Energy Saving among schools and enterprises. To help networking Belarusian stakeholders, the Project is currently developing a National EE Internet-Platform.

Was any *positive* change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO *TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS* BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

Among others, Mr. Tomas Dressen from Econoler International delivered a two-day lecture course with about 160 slides pursuant to the ToR and the Agreement between UNDP and Econoler. The training workshop went extremely successful with more than 70 trainees. The lectures were used also during the latter stages of the project training activity, namely during training sessions organized in five Oblasts. These sessions attracted more than 80 participants. At least two one-week training sessions were conducted in support of both direct consultations on a demand basis and indirect consulting actions conducted through the National EE Internet Platform (NEEP). A special virtual forum under the web-oriented NEEP was supposed to be established where any qualified energy auditing experts, including international ones, would be responding questions on-line. Offline services would be provided on a routine basis, e.g. through post, phone calls, site visits and trainings as it usually was done by the Project team and its experts. However, the implementation of this internet platform is ongoing and not finished yet.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Several regulatory documents were initiated, six of which have been adopted or accepted for further conciliation procedure, and some more normative acts / recommendations are currently under elaboration.

During its second phase, the project seriously addressed the legal and regulatory barriers to increased incentives for state organizations and other internal investors to invest in EE of the state sector. A number of the regulatory documents were drafted by the project and six of these documents were adopted by the government (these texts are referenced in the Terminal Evaluation report part 7.06 pp108).

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The Project assisted the creation of the International Energy Centre (IEC), which was established as a CJSC on September 6, 2010, as an instrument to be used for:

- (1) benchmarking typical cycles for EE projects and EE investments;
- (2) sharing knowledge and experience with Project's stakeholders;
- (3) providing learning-by-doing;
- (4) testing new EE investment schemes,
- (5) assisting in developing EE investment project pipeline;
- (6) raising actual investments.

The IEC is a self-supporting consulting and/or engineering institution and the project contributed to defining its business development strategy.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

The Project in cooperation with the IEC created a pipeline of EE projects for implementation after project closure. This new EE Investment Program for the EE Department includes, as of Oct 15 2011, at least 25 sites. About USD 120 million of loans to be allocated to this Program have been committed by one of the IEC's shareholders, Belvneshekonombank. The amount of 120 MUSD is the investment committed but not attributed/dispursed to concrete projects). The remaining loan commitment from other potential investors amounts to 17.630.000 USD.

Thus, 137.6 MUSD committed (including 120 MUSD by IEC's shareholders), out of which 46.3 MUSD invested in concrete projects, out of which 7.4 MUSD already utilized. As of Jan 1, 2012.

In addition, at least four other energy efficiency project sites have been investigated, business plans developed and feasibility study conducted. Sets of EE measures at "Slutsky Meat- Packing Factory" JSC, "Ivatsevichy Housing & Communal Services" CUE, "KrichevTsementnoShifer" MRUE, "Minsk Integrated Plant of Silicate Products" OJSC have been approved by EED, multilateral protocols have been signed between EED, UNDP and these organizations, investors attracted, investment agreements prepared and these sites have been included in the EED's Investment Program.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution? No

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

<p>Did the project contribute to any of the following:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Technologies & Approaches</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Financial Mechanisms</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> </table>	Technologies & Approaches	No	Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	Financial Mechanisms	No	<p>Please specify what was contributed:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>			
Technologies & Approaches	No									
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No									
Financial Mechanisms	No									

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place? No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

One of the project objectives components was to ensure that the projects results and approaches would be replicated. Replication of the approach should have taken place with the establishment of the IEC and the NEEP. The sustainability of these structures is still a question according to the Terminal Evaluation report.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

 <--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

 & <--dropdown menu

QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

 Measured Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
--------------------------------	---	---

Systemic
 Intended (systemic)
 Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?
 Measured
 Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the local level

The Project initiated, suggested design solutions, provided consultations, prepared and leveraged appropriate investments for more than ten EE projects. Four of them have been realized in 2008-2010, more (at least two) projects were under development at the time of Terminal Evaluation. Direct GHG emission reductions achieved as a result of implementation of these projects already exceeded 25.0 thousand tCO₂e per year.

The cumulative GHG emission reductions, resulted from operation of the four pilot sites since their commissioning, are approx. 74.84 thousand tons of CO₂e. During the reporting period (June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2011), GHG emission reduction achieved at each of pilot sites were as follows:

(1) “Keramika” JSC (Vitebsk):
 installation of 2.8 MW power plant with gas reciprocating engine, commissioned on July 12, 2008 - 4,600 tons;
 installation of variable frequency blow fans, commissioned on February 2, 2008 - 334 tons;
 replacement of liquid-packed ring vacuum pumps with oil pumps, commissioned on January 15, 2008 – 369 tons;
 installation of automated burners in furnaces, commissioned on May 10, 2009 – 509 tons;

(2) “KrasnoselskStroymaterialy” JSC:
 conversion of the boiler house to mini-CHP plant with installed power generation capacity of 4.86 MW, commissioned on March 1, 2009 - 9,056 tons;

(3) Ivatesevichi Town Utility:
 replacement of pumps at the boiler house and the water supply point and installation of variable frequency drives at the water supply point, commissioned by April 30, 2008, installation of temperature regulators for hot water supply at the boiler house and central heat supply station, commissioned by April 30, 2008, use of gas analyzer at boiler house to optimize combustion, commissioned by April 30, 2008 - 340 tons;

(4) “BeriozaStroymaterialy” JSC:
 installation of one 1.0 MW gas reciprocating engine for power generation, commissioned on August 1, 2008 - 2,236 tons;
 isolation of the furnace and installation of energy efficient furnace burners, commissioned on July 15, 2008 - 0 tons (the furnace was decommissioned and removed since Aug 25, 2010)

The expected lifecycle (15 years since Jan 2011) emission reductions from the above investments are estimated at around 374,100 tons of CO₂e.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a systemic level

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the local level

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a systemic level

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

Socioeconomic

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

[During the project, in the four pilot areas, monitoring of Energy Efficiency investment was being conducted on a regular basis.](#)

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

[UA](#)

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

[No](#)

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

[No](#)

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

No

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

Yes

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, it has been difficult to assess the changes in human development and people’s well-being that are brought by the project. However, "discussions with stakeholders and with expressions in the media indicate a positive impact".

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The Terminal Evaluation report gives the following lessons to be learned from this project:

- (1) It is critical to hire a dynamic and experienced Project Manager with the right skills and experience,
- (2) An agreement should be found before hand 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,
- (4) When projects include the establishment of electronic and / or media platforms then these outputs should be planned in the beginning and not in the end of the project,
- (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) Appropriate offices (with no lack of telephone and internet connections) should be chosen. Co-locating new projects in the offices where Executing Agencies or existing UNDP projects are located can increase effectiveness and budget efficiency,
- (7) Increased involvement of international experts, from the outset of the project, who bring international best practices, approaches and methodologies to the project in an early stage of the project will increase the effectiveness of the project,
- (8) When project outcomes include the establishment of commercial organizations, special attention should be given to maintain a level playing field,
- (9) Press and media monitoring should be an integral part of the project,
- (10) Project website should be established in an earlier stage and be updated on a regular basis.

An extended Lessons Learnt Report was supposed to be made in Jan-Feb 2012 by an international consultant from the UNDP Expert Roster (at the time of Terminal Evaluation).

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The following recommendations are given in the Terminal Evaluation report;

- (1) Project design should be based on a recent and fresh analysis of the needs of the actual and current barriers and opportunities in EE in Belarus through consultations with state officials, bankers, financiers, EE specialists, lawyers.
- (2) Several market players have voiced their concern that the IEC (a private company) was established with public funds. The UNDP's projects should be careful in not creating these concerns among commercial companies that did not have the benefit of the UNDP's support.
- (3) During the conception of the project design the terminology used in the Logframe should be defined more accurately as well as clear targets for outputs and outcomes.
- (4) Adaptive management should take place on a continual basis throughout the project, because the economic and legal environment in countries like Belarus change continuously.
- (5) Upon commencement the project manager and responsible person from the UNDP country office should discuss, and agree on the meaning of the project's Objective and the Outcomes, they should adjust the outputs and activities where necessary, and they should harmonize the work plans with the Logframe.
- (6) Monitoring and evaluation of the project results during the project should be ongoing and consistent, and should focus more on real and quantitative results instead of solely focusing at whether the formal administrative requirements are met.