



# UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

## Terminal Evaluation of the Ukraine National component of UNDP-GEF project: Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (UNDP PIMS ID 4309; GEF ID 4102)

# FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

22 DECEMBER 2020

|                              |                        |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Country(ies)                 | Ukraine                |
| UNDP-GEF Technical Team      | Chemicals              |
| Project Implementing Partner | UKR10                  |
| Project Type                 | Full Size              |
| Terminal Evaluation Period   | April 2018 - July 2020 |

## A Report for UNDP

*Review Team: Seán J. Burke*

*Project financed by  
the GEF Trust Fund*



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>GLOSSARY.....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| 1.1 Project Information Table .....   | 6         |
| 1.2 Project Description.....  | 6         |
| 1.3 Evaluation Rating Table.....  | 7         |
| 1.4 Evaluation Conclusions .....  | 7         |
| 1.5 Evaluation Recommendations .....  | 9         |
| <b>2 ABOUT THIS MID-TERM REVIEW.....</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| 2.1 About this Report.....  | 10        |
| 2.2 About the UNDP GEF Project: Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region ..... | 10        |
| 2.3 Review Objectives and Scope .....   | 11        |
| <b>3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT .....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| 3.1 Development Context .....   | 13        |
| 3.2 Problems Addressed by the Project.....  | 14        |
| 3.3 Project Description and Strategy .....  | 15        |
| 3.3.1 Project Strategy Changes and Adaptive Management.....   | 15        |
| 3.3.2 Revision and update of the national ODS-related legislation.....  | 15        |
| 3.3.3 Change of beneficiaries within the Investment component in the manufacturing sector .....               | 15        |
| 3.3.4 Addition of minor demonstration projects in the servicing sector .....                                  | 16        |
| 3.3.5 Broader awareness building programme .....  | 16        |
| 3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements .....   | 16        |
| 3.5 Project Timing and Milestones .....   | 16        |
| 3.6 Main Stakeholders .....   | 17        |
| <b>4 MAIN FINDINGS .....</b>  | <b>18</b> |
| 4.1 Project Relevance and Validity of Project Design/Formulation – Evaluation Findings.....                   | 18        |
| 4.2 Project implementation – Review Findings .....  | 19        |
| 4.3 Project towards Results and Impacts – Review Findings .....   | 28        |
| <b>5 LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>  | <b>36</b> |
| <b>6 REVIEW CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>  | <b>38</b> |
| 6.1 Final Evaluation Conclusions.....   | 38        |

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 6.2      | Evaluation Ratings.....  | 40        |
| 6.3      | Final Evaluation Recommendations.....                                      | 41        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>ANNEXES .....</b>   | <b>46</b> |
| 7.1      | Annex I: Evaluation Bibliography .....                                     | 46        |
| 7.2      | Annex II: List of Stakeholders Consulted.....                              | 48        |
| 7.3      | Annex III: Final Evaluation Framework.....                                 | 50        |
| 7.4      | Annex IV: Stakeholder Interview Questionnaire.....                         | 54        |
| 7.5      | Annex V: Final Evaluation Terms of Reference .....                         | 57        |
| 7.6      | Annex VI: Selected Project Communication November 2019 – August 2020 ..... | 81        |

## GLOSSARY

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| CDT      | (Local) Country Delivery Team           |
| Ctry/ies | Country/Countries                       |
| EC       | European Commission                     |
| EIA      | Environmental Impact Assessment         |
| EQ       | Evaluation Question                     |
| EU       | European Union                          |
| FV/FVP   | Field Visit/Field Visit Programme       |
| FE       | Final Evaluation                        |
| GEF      | Global Environment Facility             |
| GHG      | Greenhouse Gases                        |
| GWP      | Global Warming Potential                |
| HCFC     | Hydrochlorofluorocarbons                |
| MRV      | Measurement, Reporting and Verification |
| ODS      | Ozone Depleting Substances              |
| PIR      | GEF Project Implementation Report       |
| Prodoc   | Project Document                        |
| RES      | Renewable Energy Sources                |
| SES      | UNDP Social and Environmental Standards |
| SO       | Specific Outputs                        |
| TE       | Terminal Evaluation                     |
| ToR      | Terms of Reference                      |
| UNDP     | United Nations Development Programme    |

## Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to thank all those who gave their time to be consulted during the course of this final evaluation. A special word of thanks to MS Lesia Shyshko at UNDP Country Office in Ukraine, for backstopping the evaluation and the Stakeholder Consultation Programme, to Alla Tynkevych for her support, and to Inna Pokydko for her interpretation support. Last, but certainly not least, my thanks to all project stakeholders who gave their time to share their perspectives during the evaluation interview programme.

# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1.1 Project Information Table

The table below provides a summary of the UNDP GEF Project: Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region.

*Table 1.1 – Project Summary*

| Project Summary Overview     |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| UNDP PIMS ID                 | 4309  |
| GEF ID                       | 4102  |
| Title                        | Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region |
| Country(ies)                 | Regional Centre - Belarus, Istanbul, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan    |
| UNDP-GEF Technical Team      | Chemicals   |
| Project Implementing Partner | SVK10   |
| Joint Agencies               | <i>(not set or not applicable)</i>                                      |
| Project Type                 | Full Size   |

## 1.2 Project Description

UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub was in charge of implementing the project “Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)” (PIMS 4309), and UNDP Country Offices in respective partner countries played a relevant role. The project’s goal was to respond to the Montreal Protocol obligations in HCFC phase out schedules of the participating countries, namely Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. The project’s main objective was improving regulatory measures to help address the accelerated HCFC phase-out over the medium to longer-term, and to prepare and strengthen the involved countries for the complete phase-out of HCFCs.

The project was designed to address two principal components, these being of a regional and national dimension, the **Component 1 - Regional information exchange and networking component**: Addressing barriers associated with incomplete knowledge and awareness, and **Component 2 - National capacity building and technical assistance component**: Supporting the adoption of the fully completed HCFC phase-out strategy, capacity building and supply of analytical and servicing equipment/tools for the Environmental Inspectorate and Customs Departments. Regarding the **Ukraine national component**, activities foreseen under Component 2 were only partially completed at the final date of the extension period. The significantly delayed implementation necessitated major revision, with this leading to an additional no-cost extension period until 31 July 2020.

This evaluation report is intended as a complementary report to the final evaluation of the regional project formulated earlier at the closure of the regional component and the 3 national components for Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Belarus<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Terminal Evaluation of the Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan), September 2018.

## 1.3 Evaluation Rating Table

The evaluation ratings table is set out below:

| Evaluation Ratings:            |           |   |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation   | rating    | 2. IA& EA Execution                           | rating    |
| M&E design at entry            | <b>S</b>  | Quality of UNDP Implementation                | <b>MU</b> |
| M&E Plan Implementation        | <b>S</b>  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency       | <b>MU</b> |
| Overall quality of M&E         | <b>MU</b> | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | <b>U</b>  |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes      | rating    | 4. Sustainability                             | Rating    |
| Relevance                      | <b>HS</b> | Financial resources:                          | <b>U</b>  |
| Effectiveness                  | <b>S</b>  | Socio-political:                              | <b>U</b>  |
| Efficiency                     | <b>MU</b> | Institutional framework and governance:       | <b>MU</b> |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | <b>MU</b> | Environmental:                                | <b>MU</b> |
|                                |           | Overall likelihood of sustainability:         | <b>MU</b> |

## 1.4 Evaluation Conclusions

The final evaluation conclusions are set out below. Each conclusion (C) is numbered.

- C1 - Relevance:** The project was evaluated relevant to the Ukrainian context in the way that it provided the necessary assistance in terms of funding, guidance and staffing to the unit on ozone depletion of the MENR to comply with the Montreal Protocol obligations. Without such support, the interviewees testify that the progress accomplished would not have been feasible.
- C1 – Project Design:** The project has been highly relevant to the Ukraine's context and needs given its requirement under the Protocol to phase-out of production and consumption in 2020, Furthermore, as well as providing support to Ukraine set limitations in regulation of HCFC consumption, strengthen Ukraine's national capacity to control HCFC imports, and strengthening of licensing systems and introduction HCFC monitoring. Similarly, it provided support to address capacity needs in various state agencies, such as the State Customs Service required in order to allow effective monitoring of HCFC imports and HFCFC end-use.
- C3 - Implementation challenges:** Project implementation has been severely constrained by a range of challenges. This has included the change in the geo-political environment, over which the project had no control, but even more important has been the lack of sufficient high-level political engagement and leadership from the Government of Ukraine, significant political instability and constantly changing Ministerial appointments which have deprived the project of steady high-level commitment and continuity of that commitment. Other constraints have included overly bureaucratic implementation environment at the primary beneficiary Ministry for Ecology and Natural Resources, and none of these issues have been significantly addressed or mitigated by the project. Going forward, it is imperative that any future success initiative derives credible solutions and mitigation measures to address, or at least manage, these issues.

- 4. Effectiveness.** The overall effectiveness of the project was affected by insufficient governmental capacity, and by technological and operational challenges, creating delays in the completion of the project objectives. The overall effectiveness of the project was affected by a series of challenges, including insufficient governmental capacity, lack of country ownership and leadership, and by technological and operational challenges, creating delays in the completion of the project objectives. This severely slowed down delivery of project activities, which was further exacerbated by weak project management at least two intervals in the project. Notwithstanding the challenges, there has been however a relatively significant level of completion of project activities and outputs, even if these have been realised in a much-prolonged timeframe compared to the original regional project. Examples are some of the capacity development and equipment procurement and supply for the State Customs Service, the support to drafting the Framework Law, the interest generated in the Call for Proposals, and the work done on the conversion demonstration projects. All of these activities, and others, have generated praise from government stakeholders during the stakeholder interviews, and appreciation of UNDP support under the project. The quality of advice and support provided by the international conversion experts, in a challenging implementation context, was one area of excellence, even if the learning and follow-up expected from a demonstration project was not maximised afterwards.
- 5. Efficiency.** Many operational and administrative issues have come in the way of the efficiency of the project, such as insufficient governmental capacity leading to the adoption of a legislation with reduced impact and inability to accurately report HCFC consumption data at the country-level preventing the relevant stakeholders from monitoring their progress towards success and planning their actions accordingly. Even if many of the project actions were completed, the implementation challenges mentioned above have significantly comprised the overall efficiency of the project, when one compares the time required for completion compared to the implementation timeframe of the other regional project member countries, and this has represented a significant opportunity cost for the Ukraine.
- 6. Progress to Impact.** The project extension has enabled Ukraine to achieve a majority of its intended outputs, and some of its impacts, such as the adoption of a Law on Ozone Depleting substances, the implementation of three major contracts for ODS conversion, and the supply of equipment for ODS detection training and increased awareness among its stakeholders. While some actions require some extra steps to be taken to reach full completion, the lack of country ownership and leadership, a highly bureaucratic implementation environment and a lack of engagement of all stakeholders means that progress towards impact is less than what would be expected based on the level of completion of project activities and outputs.
- 7. Sustainability:** Overall, the project has registered mixed results in terms of sustainability, with regard financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, overall likelihood of sustainability. Regarding the policy and regulatory level, the new framework law provides represents an important milestone, although it will require administrative orders to be enforced, while the legislative documents on the broader non-ODS regulations adopted must be completed with sub-regulations on HCFC for adequately supporting the implementation of the MP in Ukraine, while ratification of the Kigali Amendment by the Parliament of Ukraine is also pending<sup>2</sup>. Another positive is that there is some level of raised awareness among relevant stakeholders and the public about ozone depletion and the importance of phase out work in respect of ODS, even if level of increase is somewhat difficult to measure. However, institutional arrangements are not in place for effective consultation and involvement of all relevant

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.k-cep.org/wp-content/themes/kigali/page-templates/map/MapRatification.html>



stakeholders, nor is a clear strategy for going forward is not in place, nor a costing and financial plan and how financial sustainability could be optimised.

8. **Country ownership.** Country ownership has been inadequate, in significant part due to the political environment of Ukraine during the project's implementation period, leading to frequent change of stakeholders (ministers, focal points) and of the level of authority of the main institution (MENR merging with MONE in 2019, then separating in 2020). Moreover, there has been a lack of co-ordination with relevant government and non-government stakeholders, and in particular with the private sector.
9. **Gender equality and women's empowerment.** There has been no specific mention of integration of gender equality and women's empowerment component in the project results, although some aspects of the project have had above-average participation of women. However, there is scope for a more systematic approach to mainstreaming gender.

## 1.5 Evaluation Recommendations

The final evaluation recommendations are set out below. In total there are 7 recommendations elaborated, as summarised below:

| No. | Recommendation Summary (Title)  | Addressed To                                  |
|-----|---|---|
| R1  | Develop a transition project of targeted post-project actions to boost visibility of results and ensure continuity                      | UNDP CO                                       |
| R2  | Carry out rapid feasibility work to relaunch a national Ozone Centre  | UNDP (with support requested from Government) |
| R3  | Formulate a transition project with the aim of supporting the development of a credible national strategy                               | UNDP CO, UNDP IRH, MENR, Other Ministries     |
| R4  | Develop credible and workable implementation arrangements for implementing a national strategy  | MENR, Other Ministries                        |
| R5  | Develop a gender mainstreaming and gender promotion strategy and action plan for post-project actions and transition projects           | UNDP, MENR                                    |
| R6  | Consider setting up a dedicated project management centre within the Ministry to improve project management and implementation delivery | MENR  |
| R7  | Put practices in place in UNDP CO to ensure improved dialogue with leadership of counterpart Ministries.                                | UNDP CO                                       |

## 2 ABOUT THIS MID-TERM REVIEW

### 2.1 About this Report

This document sets out the draft of the Final Evaluation (FE) report for Terminal Evaluation of the Ukraine National component of UNDP-GEF project: Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region. The Final Evaluation process is conducted in line with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy<sup>3</sup> and the FE report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 (this section) sets out the background context, some summary information about the Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region project, and the evaluation objectives, scope and work programme;
- Section 3 sets out the **Project Development Context**
- Section 4 sets out the **Evaluation Findings**
- Section 6 sets out the **Lessons Learned**
- Section 6 sets out the **Evaluation Conclusions and Recommendations**
- Section 7 sets out the **Evaluation Report Annexes**.

This evaluation report is intended as a complementary report to the final evaluation of the regional project formulated earlier at the closure of the regional component and the 3 national components for Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Belarus<sup>4</sup>.

### 2.2 About the UNDP GEF Project: Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region

The UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub was in charge of implementing the project “Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)” (PIMS 4309), and UNDP Country Offices in respective partner countries played a relevant role. The project’s goal was to respond to the Montreal Protocol obligations in HCFC phase out schedules of the participating countries, namely Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. The project’s main objective was improving regulatory measures to help address the accelerated HCFC phase-out over the medium to longer-term, and to prepare and strengthen the involved countries for the complete phase-out of HCFCs.

The project was designed to address two principal components, these being of a regional and national dimension:

- **Component 1 - Regional information exchange and networking component:** Addressing barriers associated with incomplete knowledge and awareness. The component was implemented at UNDP regional level (initially out of UNDP Bratislava Regional Center, and later on from a new UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.thegef.org/gef/Evaluation%20Policy%202010>

<sup>4</sup> Terminal Evaluation of the Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan), September 2018.

- **Component 2 - National capacity building and technical assistance component:** Supporting the adoption of the fully completed HCFC phase-out strategy, capacity building and supply of analytical and servicing equipment/tools for the Environmental Inspectorate and Customs Departments.

Belarus and Tajikistan closed their national components in early 2017, and Uzbekistan national component activities were closed at the end of July 2018. Regarding the Ukraine national component for the Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT region project, the activities undertaken under Component 1 were completed within the period. However, activities foreseen under Component 2 were only partially completed at the final date of the extension period. The significantly delayed implementation necessitated major revision, with this leading to an additional no-cost extension period until 31 July of 2020, approved by the UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator in a Project Board meeting on 27 of April of 2018. In this respect the project's design involves 3 Components, as set out in Table 1 below.

**Table 2.1 - Overview Project Structure by Core Component**

| Component          | Focus  | Core Activity  |
|--------------------|--|--|
| <b>Component 1</b> | Regional component designed to assist on the key aspects of HCFC phase-out that are common to the four participating countries | <i>This component has been successfully implemented. Key outcomes of this component were achieved and no change is planned in the current substantive revision. It is therefore not included in this evaluation.</i>   |
| <b>Component 2</b> | National sub-components for the individual participating countries   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and endorsement of formal national HCFC phase-out strategies and action plans.</li> <li>• National level capacity strengthening of customs, enforcement officials and refrigeration service technicians; and</li> <li>• Targeted HCFC Phase-out investment programme and demonstration projects.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Component 3</b> | Monitoring and evaluation of the project.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-Term Evaluation</li> <li>• Final Evaluation</li> </ul>  |

Regarding project **stakeholders and governance and ownership arrangements**, the Project Board is comprised of the following institutions: UNDP IRH Manager, Representatives of UNDP MPU/Chemicals Unit and UNDP COs, Representatives of respective Ministries of project countries (Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR)-Ukraine).

## 2.3 Review Objectives and Scope

As per the evaluation guidelines for evaluation of UNDP-GEF financed projects, this Final Evaluation is tasked with generating an assessment of the project using as a minimum the core OECD DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The Final Evaluation is to assess the following three categories of project progress – i) Project Design/Formulation, ii) Project Implementation, and iii) Project Results and Impacts.

**Table 2.2 - Overview FE Categories of Progress and Sub-Areas**

| Category                           | Focus Areas/Issues   |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Project Design/Formulation</b>  | <p>TE report will undertake an assessment of the project design, in order to identify whether the design was effective in helping the project reach expected results, especially if an MTR was not required, aspects to be reviewed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators</li> <li>• Assumptions and Risks</li> <li>• Lessons from other relevant projects</li> <li>• Planned stakeholder participation</li> <li>• Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector</li> <li>• Gender responsiveness of project design</li> <li>• Social and Environmental Safeguards</li> </ul>     |
| <b>Project Implementation</b>      | <p>The TE team will assess project implementation and will also critically review the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptive management</li> <li>• Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements</li> <li>• Project finance and co-finance</li> <li>• Monitoring &amp; Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment of M&amp;E</li> <li>• Implementing Agency (UNDP) and Executing Agency, overall project oversight/implementation and execution</li> <li>• Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Project Results and Impacts</b> | <p>TE report must include an assessment of results as measured by broader aspects such as<sup>5</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress Towards Objective and Expected Outcomes</li> <li>• Relevance</li> <li>• Effectiveness</li> <li>• Efficiency</li> <li>• Overall project outcome</li> <li>• Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, overall likelihood of sustainability</li> <li>• Country ownership</li> <li>• Gender equality and women's empowerment</li> <li>• Cross-cutting issues</li> <li>• GEF Additionally</li> <li>• Catalytic/ Replication Effect</li> <li>• Progress to Impact</li> </ul> |

<sup>5</sup> As described in the Guidance for Conducting Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.

## 3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT



### Section Guide

*This section sets out the principal review findings with regard to:*

- *Project development context (Section 3.1)*
- *Problems addressed by the Project (Section 3.2)*
- *Project description and strategy (Section 3.3)*
- *Project implementation arrangements (Section 3.4)*
- *Project timing and milestones (Section 3.5)*
- *Main stakeholders (Section 3.6)*

### 3.1 Development Context

Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region's rationale is rooted in the Montreal Protocol's initiative on the elimination of substances depleting the ozone layer, and more particularly in the accelerated Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out requirements in Belarus, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine. The Copenhagen Amendment of the Montreal Protocol of 1992 stipulated that countries need to reduce their HCFC consumption to 10% of their baseline by 2015, 0.5% in 2020 and achieve full phase out in 2030. During the Implementation Committee in 2012, Ukraine was declared non-compliant with the HCFC consumption control measures and required to conduct national actions to return to its compliance. The project, conducted by the UNDP and funded by the GEF, aimed to support the country in achieving:

- A finalized and adopted HCFC accelerated phase-out strategy and action plan,
- Implementation of national level training for Environmental and Customs enforcement authorities,
- Targeted HCFC phase out investment projects in eligible enterprises in the manufacturing sector and information exchange on emerging HCFC substitute technologies for ineligible companies.

Conducted under the authority of the MENR, the project seeks to attain the following benefits:

- Reducing the HCFC consumption of 308 metric tons annually during the years 2011 to 2014, and sustaining capacities to not increase HCFC consumption in relation with future increases in the production.
- Strengthened institutions enabled to enforce sustainably HCFC control measures and conduct proactively the HCFC phase-out, in relation with all the relevant stakeholders involved in HCFC regulation, trade control and consumption.
- Enhanced knowledge and information exchange engagement at the national and global levels to support the national institutions in their management, planning and execution of HCFC phase-out.
- Technological conversion to non-ODS/low-GWP substances in the industries.
- Reducing HCFC import and total consumption by improving HCFC recycling infrastructures and encouraging reuse of the substance.
- Strengthened unwanted ODS waste storage capacity resulting in better segregation of waste containing HCFC and supporting HCFC reuse scheme, particularly for service industries.

- Raised awareness among stakeholders involved in HCFC consuming industries on the correlation between HCFC phase-out and climate change benefits, while introducing alternative non-ODS/low-GWP substances for technological conversion, unwanted ODS storage and HCFC recycling scheme, particularly in the refrigeration and A/C sectors.
- Raised awareness on the need for HCFC phase-out among policymakers, relevant stakeholders and the public, to stimulate the necessary attention to conduct HCFC phase-out schedule and action plan effectively.

### **3.2 Problems Addressed by the Project**

Based on the HCFC surveys conducted in the participating countries prior to this project, following findings across the region including Ukraine were identified and were taken into account in managing country phase out strategies:

- The overall HCFC consumption in Ukraine has been on the rise since 2008 with the introduction and expansion of various industries and services using and importing HCFC, such as XPS foam boards and refrigeration equipment.
- The absence of introduction of control measures of HCFC consumption while HCFC use expanded in the industry, hindering the Ukraine and other project countries' capacity to meet their 2013 phase-out obligations and jeopardized its future capacity to attain its 2015 goals.
- National HCFC consumption data tends to be inaccurately reported to the Ozone Secretariat, as country-specific barriers can prevent from an overall realistic assessment. Indeed, gaps in Ukraine's institutional capacity and HCFC licensing system led to HCFC underreporting to the monitoring institutions.
- To meet with their phase-out obligations, the countries demonstrated a need for immediate support on the implementation of regulatory HCFC measures, rectified HCFC licensing systems, enhanced customs capacities, and technological assistance and awareness raising on alternative non-ODS technologies to support the relevant private sector stakeholders in their conversion out of HCFC (principally the refrigeration service sector).
- Other than the very noticeable use of HCFC in XPS foam boards, a more potent ODS known as HCFC-141b was found in other industrial productions including rigid foam, polyol blending and solvent sectors. While this HCFC consumption accounts for a smaller proportion of the national HCFC use as calculated in metric tons, its elimination faces more challenges as it is widely used in the country by a large range of small users and meets difficulty for technology conversion as there are no substance equivalating with the solvent efficiency on the local markets.

During the preparatory activities for the regional project, a number of barriers that prevented effective implementation of Montreal Protocol obligations were identified in Ukraine which includes:

- Sustainability of institutional capacity
- Refrigerant management capacity and wide fragmentation of the servicing sectors
- Partial eligibility of the manufacturing sector as the principal HCFC consumer
- Absence of ability to effectively limit import of HCFC containing equipment that creates a long-term HCFC "consumption bubble"

- Weak interdepartmental coordination and enforcement capacity lacking import controls
- Lack of ability to monitor the incoming ODS materials in gas containers
- Limited introduction of low GWP and energy efficient technologies
- Historical credibility issues in demonstration of compliance with MP obligations
- Weak interest from HCFC end-users to cooperate with the Government.

### **3.3 Project Description and Strategy**

The long-term objective of this project is anchored on environmental and human health protection by providing assistance to countries including Ukraine to phase out consumption as well as to prevent releases of ozone-depleting substances. To achieve this objective, the project was designed through a combination of regional and national mechanisms that includes: a) enabling-type of activities complemented with experience exchange and networking, contained in the regional Component 1. This pertains to regional accelerated phase-out capacity building and was successfully implemented and completed by 31 July 2018. Key outcomes of this component were achieved and evaluated, and no change or activities were planned in the project extension phase; and b) specific technical assistance and capacity building activities contained in the country-oriented Component 2. Component 3 covered the project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities.

#### **3.3.1 Project Strategy Changes and Adaptive Management**

Implemented under UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2012-2016, the national project in Ukraine has been in a Direct Execution Modality in close partnership with the major project counterparts, particularly the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine in present).

The originally planned project closing date was 30 July 2016. But based on specific delays in Ukraine and uneven progress with the national components in other countries, a request for 2-year project extension until 31 July 2018 was discussed and approved at the regional Project Board meeting in June 2015.

#### **3.3.2 Revision and update of the national ODS-related legislation**

The original Project Document for the national component in Ukraine was going to provide legislative and policy options for HCFC phase-out and control that included complete formulation of HCFC phase-out strategy. Although the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources reportedly started preparing the intended HCFC phase-out strategy during the onset of the project, the Government no longer pursued the HCFC phase-out strategy. Instead, since 2018, it intended to integrate HCFC phase-out into a broader legislation on Ozone Depleting Substances and F-Gases. Although viewed to be a comprehensive legislation, it is deemed slower in view of its complexities and lengthy legislative process.

#### **3.3.3 Change of beneficiaries within the Investment component in the manufacturing sector**

Due to external circumstances beyond the project's scope and control, a major project revision in 2018 included replacement of beneficiary organizations entitled for technical assistance for technology conversion to non ODS alternatives. These two new beneficiaries (Private Company "Khimpostachanlnyk" and "VKF Edvans" LLC – producers of preblended polyols for spray foaming applications) were to receive financial assistance for using non-ODS foaming agent instead of the conventionally used HCFC-141b.



### 3.3.4 Addition of minor demonstration projects in the servicing sector

Prior to the extension of the project, the national component in Ukraine experienced delays and during the revision of the Ukraine national project component demonstration pilots were included, which were duly implemented, and notwithstanding challenges linked to the pilots' implementation coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic, which not surprisingly had a significant impact on its implementation.

### 3.3.5 Broader awareness building programme

The Terminal Evaluation of the regional project that included assessment of the national project component in Ukraine recommended public outreach efforts to be complemented by demonstration of economic benefits from pursuing good practices. The same recommendation highlighted the importance of public outreach that would "help with translation of the technical language related to the Montreal Protocol into communications easily understandable by the general public and will thus make a notable contribution to the public awareness facet of the project". This was also added in the revised Project Document.

## 3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements

Regarding **project stakeholders and governance and ownership arrangements**, the national Project Board is comprised of the following institutions: UNDP Country Office as the national project executive, UNDP IRH as the senior supplier for the regional component of the national project, UNDP CO as the senior supplier for the national component, and representatives of the relevant ministries as senior beneficiaries of the project, including the MENR.

The UNDP Country Office is the **Implementing Partner** for Accelerated HCFC Phase Out Project in Ukraine, and thus responsible for overall project management and implementation at country-level under the guidance of the national Project Board.

During the course of the project's implementation, the Ukraine has faced an environment of political instability, economic crisis and institutional changes, which has exerted a significant adverse influence on its implementation capacity and efficiency. Among others, a full project ownership on the part of the senior beneficiary MENR was not achieved and only 1 out of the 4 industries targeted for piloting the technological conversion remained, resulting in considerable operational delays and leading to a 2-years extension of the project.

## 3.5 Project Timing and Milestones

The table below sets out the key project dates and milestones:

**Table 3.1 – Overview Project Dates and Milestones**

| Key Project Dates/Milestones                          |                  |
|---|------------------|
| PIF Approval Date                                     | 7 May 2010       |
| CEO Endorsement Date                                  | 30 August 2012   |
| Project Document Signature Date (project start date): | 29 May 2013      |
| Actual Date of Mid-term Review                        | 17 August 2016   |
| Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation                  | 31 July 2018     |
| Original Planned Closing Date                         | 22 February 2016 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date                          | 31 July 2020     |



### 3.6 Main Stakeholders

The principal stakeholders of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Ukraine component) are:

- The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine (formerly the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources)<sup>6</sup>.
- The State Fiscal Service of Ukraine
- The State Environmental Inspectorate
- Education Institutions including the Custom Training Centre and the State Custom Academy
- HCFC Importers
- HCFC users
- Other civil society organisations having a role in the Montreal Protocol Implementation including industry associations

The project also aimed to target the public in raising national awareness on the correlation between the reduction of ODS and climate change benefits, and on the country's obligations towards the MP. It also promotes the exchange of information, technology and best practices between the actors of HCFC conversion and prevention in Ukraine with their congeners at the regional/global level. The main stakeholders as identified in the listing above received assistance, training and/or financial support from the UNDP and GEF to conduct their actions for HCFC phase-out.

---

<sup>6</sup> The name of the Ministry was changed from Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources to *Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural resources of Ukraine* in June 2020.

## 4 MAIN FINDINGS



### Section Guide

*This section sets out the principal review findings with regard to:*

- *Project Design/Formulation (Section 4.1)*
- *Project implementation (Section 4.2)*
- *Project results and impacts (Section 4.3)*

### 4.1 Project Relevance and Validity of Project Design/Formulation – Evaluation Findings

#### Project Design

The overall project has been designed to specifically address the principal problems and barriers identified above based on the overall project framework structure set out in the original GEF Project Identification Form (PIF). The project structure consists of three interlinked components as follows: Component 1 is the regional component designed to assist on the following key aspects of HCFC phase-out that are common to the four participating countries which has been completed, while Component 3 focussed on monitoring and evaluation of the project. Hence, this evaluation focuses (primarily) on Component 2 which comprises the national sub-components for Ukraine. It should be noted that each of the four sub-components aims at: i) Development and endorsement of formal national HCFC phase-out strategies and action plans; ii) National level capacity strengthening of customs, enforcement officials and refrigeration service technicians; Targeted HCFC Phase-out investment programme and demonstration projects.

While focussing primarily on Component 2, it needs to be underlined that assessing the project design of the Ukraine national sub-component needs to take account that this was designed in the context of a regional project. Under the Regional Project's design, Component 1 was designed to provide the regional framework, including in particular regional knowledge exchange and networking, and focussing on key aspects of HCFC phase-out common to the four participating countries. Component 2 comprising the national sub-components for each of the four participating countries. This component had consistent focus, with each of the four countries individual sub-component aiming at i) the development and endorsement of formal national HCFC phase-out strategies and action plans, ii) strengthening of national capacity levels of customs, enforcement officials and refrigeration service technicians, as well as iii) a HCFC Phase-out investment programme and demonstration projects. In the case of the Ukraine,

Parties to the MP are obliged to ensure full compliance with HCFC phase-out schedules and are thus not eligible for phase-out delays, which are reserved only for developing countries under Article 5 of the Protocol. Moreover, Protocol signatories are also not eligible to receive financial assistance from the Multilateral Fund for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol (MLF). As with the other countries participating in this regional framework, the Ukraine was consulted on the project design and formulation, with this consultation taking place through its designated National Focal Point. The original project concept was developed with the consent of the four participating Governments and a designated National Focal Point from each country participated at the project conception.

Regarding design, stakeholder interviews showed that the project design was generally seen to be more than satisfactory, with the grants component and company demonstration projects being seen as strong elements, as well as the focus on putting in place the required legislative framework. Few stakeholders identified weaknesses, with the main weakness identified being the that the project's planned duration was too short, and to a much lesser degree a lack of a sufficiently pronounced gender dimension.

## **Relevance**

The project has been highly relevant to the Ukrainian context in that it has helped Ukraine to move to compliance with its requirements under the Montreal Protocol in specific areas where the country lacked the knowledge and capabilities.

Based on Decision XIX/6 of the Meeting with other Parties in the Region, Ukraine (like Belarus, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan) is required to have completed the accelerated phase-out of production and consumption in 2030, on the basis of the following reduction steps: i) By 2010 of 75 Mid Term Review of UNDP -GEF Project: "Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region" 25 per cent; ii) By 2015 of 90 per cent; and iii) While allowing 0.5 per cent for servicing the period 2020– 2030. Firstly, the project provides support to Ukraine in its efforts to set limitations in regulation of HCFC consumption. Secondly, it has helped strengthen Ukraine's national capacity to control HCFC imports, as well as, strengthening of licensing systems, and introduction of HCFC monitoring. Similarly, capacity levels in various state agencies, such as the State Customs Service, needed capacity developed to allow them to monitor and control HCFC imports and HFCFC end-use. Furthermore, it has been relevant to Ukraine's national context in its ambition of developing and reinforcing technical, education and institutional potential for HCFC phase-out. This relevance is further underlined by the history of Ukraine's lack of past progress in ensuring adherence to the Protocol, suggesting that external impetus and support was required. Stakeholder consultations carried out during the evaluation underline the project's relevance to Ukraine's needs and national context, emphasising that the project brought technical expertise, funding and guidance to comply with the Montreal Protocol obligations that the country lacked, and without such support stakeholders emphasized that the progress accomplished would not have been possible. Moreover, stakeholders pointed out that implementation challenges and delays were not a produce of any lack of relevance.

## **4.2 Project implementation – Review Findings**

### **Project Management and Adaptive Management**

There were issues of adaptive management for the national project in Ukraine due to political instability and lack of Government ownership of the project created issues of adaptive management for the national project in Ukraine. Consequently. Implementation delays ensued which led the Project Board to have a Two-stage revision of the project. This required more painstaking efforts on the part of the implementing agency (UNDP) to affirm government's renewed commitment to the project. The revision and extension of the project had the virtue of providing the government with an opportunity to realign its phasing out targets on the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances as provided in the Montreal protocol.

Project management performance on UNDP's side appears mixed. At specific periods in the project, there has been a poor choice of project manager (or at the least a lack of management oversight of specific partner relationships and communications skills deficits) and a resultant deterioration in relations with the primary beneficiary Ministry. As an example of some of the challenges in project management and governance, Annex 6 to the report sets out a chronology of selected Project Board Discussions and follow-up communication between MENR and UNDP Country Office (CO). The content shows specific instances of dissatisfaction on the

part of the Ministry, and at times issues of believing it had not been properly consulted (e.g., on Calls for Proposals focus), but what is most striking is the lapse of time over which these issues were 'in play' (from November 2019 to beyond the project), showing issues of insufficient relationship management and troubleshooting, as well as an overly administrative approach to implementation on both sides.

It should be emphasised that the above project management and partner engagement deficits stand in contrast to the commitment and dedication of other members of the UNDP project team who continued to try to progress implementation in what was a distinctly challenging implementation environment, and under the new UNDP Country Office management there is determination to rebuild the relationship and to learn from this project implementation experience. It should be also emphasised, however, that there has also been strong aspects to the project management, not least in the selection and support of outstanding experts to implement the company demonstration projects, which drew fulsome praise from the beneficiary companies when interviewed.

### **Risk Management**

Regarding risk management, the project has not placed sufficient focus on political and economic risks, which were for example not really considered during the project's inception phase. Through monitoring and evaluation and adaptive management, some adjustments were made to the project, including a project revision and a subsequent project extension. Overall, however, there has been lack of focus on a number of issues, such as building a strong ownership basis and not focussing sufficiently on the private sector. Towards the end of the project, the project also had to reach to the COVID-19 and related restrictions, something which could not have been foreseen and which has had an important effect in also contributing to a lack of a strong push to complete as many actions as possible in the project.

Regarding **Social and Environmental Standards**, no environmental and social issues have been identified in the 2017 and 2019 PIRs, while in the 2018 cooperation between HCFC users and the government in Ukraine was raised as being sensitive, or more specifically being weak side, and it was suggested that the project could have a mediation role given the direct government's responsibility to manage the HCFC phase-out process. It is not clear that this was progressed, although it does point somewhat to a lack of sufficient engagement and leadership from the government.

### **Gender**

For the most part there was a lack of gender considerations in the project design, and subsequent revision, although it should be noted that on UNDP Gender Marker the project was scored at zero as a project that not expected to make an appreciable contribute to gender equality. Furthermore, both the mid-term and terminal evaluations assessed that gender-related information was not systematically collected throughout the project implementation<sup>7</sup>, while stakeholder interviews for this evaluation of the Ukraine national component also did not demonstrate a consistent focus on gender. At a more practical level however, gender equality does not seem problematic - for example, the terminal evaluation noted the more-than-equal representation of women in the Ukraine enforcement agencies, as well as in participation in the project's capacity building activities Ukrainian customs and enforcement officers. Another example was the educational component of the investment component for the Polyfoam Company, where the female staff of the chemical laboratory of the company received training by the International Foam Expert overseeing and advising on the enterprise conversion work, while female staff members of the Chemical Lab of the Khimpostachalnyk company have been also been trained by the International Foam Expert.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Regional Project Board did however decide on an ad-hoc budget allocation to allow the launch of a gender analysis/baseline study related to ODS.

## Implementation Challenges

Once partnership with the MENR was fully restored in 2017, a decision was taken on the scope of revision needed for the national components, and with a special support of a group of international experts recruited for this purpose, the project documentation has been re-formatted with keeping the overall objective of assisting the Government to stay in compliance with its HCFC phase-out obligations. Therefore, with the justification above Ukraine component's request for additional 2-year extension was formally approved by UNDP-GEF Coordinator, with a new project closure date of 31 July 2020.

## Stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements

In view of the project revision and the subsequent extension of the project until July 2020, the Project team accelerated the implementation and the delivery of outputs due to partnership with -private companies for the project investment component and completion of one related contract on the technological conversion to non-ODS production. The project was also able to accelerate its awareness raising activities in view of its partnership with civil society and academia. The project has partnered with the government (National Ozone Unit of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine, Parliament and Customs Office) on HCFC management legislation which is required to exercise better controls in this specific field of work, and report to the Ozone Secretariat and parties of the Montreal protocol on such achievements. The extent to which stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements is deemed stronger during the extension party because of increased government commitment on the project. Without ownership from the government counterpart, mobilizing participation and cooperative arrangements with local partners would almost always be difficult.

## Project finance and co-finance

The funds committed for the project in Ukraine (as of the project inception) and actual implementation of the GEF grant are summarized in Table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.1 - Funds committed for the project (as of the project inception) and actual implementation of the GEF grant (In Million \$)**

| Funding                           | Funds Committed | Amount       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| GEF Trust Fund                    | 3.19            |              |
| Co-Financing Fund                 | 9.9             |              |
| Total                             | 13.090          |              |
| Total Expense as of June 30, 2018 |                 | 1.529        |
| Total Expense to Budget           |                 | 47.93%       |
| <b>Remaining Budget</b>           |                 | <b>1.661</b> |

The co-financing data for Ukraine was not provided in view of the cancellation of the investment projects in the PU foam and XPS sectors and the substantive revision of the Ukraine national component. As noted by the Evaluator of the TE, there was no evidence of systematic collection and monitoring of the co-finance data by neither of the project teams or any other entity within the project. Immediate attention should be given especially that co-financing is crucial in mobilizing resources to achieve GEF objectives.

During the implementation period of the regional project, implementation lagged behind the other participating countries, and at the time of the project extension the project registered an expense to budget ratio of under 50% (at 48% precisely), due to the outstanding deliverables to be carried over to the project revision and extension under a remaining budget envelope of USD 1.661 million. Of this remaining budget of USD 1.661, allocation for the following was earmarked during the extension, more than three-quarters of the budget (specifically, USD 1.331 million) was earmarked for work on national-level capacity strengthening and HCFC Phase-out investment, with USD 290,00 budgeted for project management and USD 40,00 for monitoring and evaluation.

### **Monitoring & Evaluation**

M&E was completed for Ukraine within the Regional Component. It is noted that monitoring was also carried out through periodic missions of the members of the regional project team to the countries and site visits of the national project teams which gave them relevant information on the progress of the project. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans with corresponding budgets were developed during the design of the project. The plans listed M&E activities along with the designated parties regarding their responsibility and corresponding timeframes. All M&E activities were performed in accordance with the Project Documents. The Regional Project Board included a manager of UNDP IRH as executive, and representatives of UNDP MU/Chemicals Units, UNDP Country Offices from each participating country and of the Ministries involved in each project country. This Regional Project Board had the responsibility to provide direction to the project and had decisional power on the commitment of resources. In 2014, the Regional Project Board did not meet due to the relocation of the RBC and establishment of the IRH, and instead exchanged via e-mail. At the national level, National Project Boards were established and were composed of an executive from the UNDP Country Office, representatives of UNDP IRH and Country Offices as well as main beneficiary stakeholders from the relevant ministries. Coordination between the Regional and National Project Boards was ensured by the regional and national project teams, and facilitated by the presence of the representatives from the relevant ministries at both levels. Project Meetings occurred once a year and were held during two days during which progress towards impact was evaluated with both country prospect and regional prospect. The Project Meetings enabled necessary exchanges to complement the annual Regional Project Board. Project execution occurred at the multi-country level, and activities realized were reported in corresponding project documentation such as results frameworks, workplans and budget, as planned and validated during the annual planning. Annual work plans were established for every year of the project implementation and submitted to the Project Board for approval, and progress towards impact monitoring was achieved periodically through visits of the regional project teams to the country and to the sites relevant to project development. As for the Ukraine project, M&E contributed to provide valuable inputs that fed into the development of the revision of the project document for project extension, such as the necessity for further awareness raising that was rightly cited in the MTR.

### **Implementing Agency (UNDP) and Executing Agency, Overall project implementation and execution.**

Notwithstanding the challenges related to political and economic instability, a more substantive progress was achieved with respect to the implementation of a system house's sub-component. However, beyond the control of the Implementing Agency and Executing Agency, the pandemic compounded the situation especially that the extension was supposed to be until July 31, 2020. Many actions understandably required some extra and finishing steps to be taken to deliver the outstanding output yet overall progress towards realization of outcomes was observed, with the constraints mentioned regarding a lack of real country

leadership and a failure by the Ministry to work to creating a national implementation momentum that could support execution of a strategy.

Analysis of the Combined Delivery Reports for 2013-2019 shows that from the total disbursed budget for Ukraine of 3,044,625.80 USD, Svc Co Services (in 7 different sectors) represents 45.61 % of the total spent budget, followed by the fees for consultants (international and national consultants) at 26.73% and the Office's costs at 14.21%. The total budget allocated to grants has been of 174,900.00 USD, representing the 5.74% of the total budget disbursed during the past eight years. In contrast, learning costs have been of only 51,519.55 USD which is 1.69% of all the budget. Per diems and travel costs have represented respectively 1.67% (50,944.95 USD) and 1.45% (44,288.78 USD) of the total budget.

Among the Svc Co services, the Svc Co-Construction and Engineer have represented the 31.78% (967,477.53USD) of the total budget and 69.66% of the Svc Co Services budget (1,388,845.81USD), followed by the Svc Co-Natural Resources and Environment with 13.38% (407,294.75 USD) of the project's total budget and 29.33% of the Svc Co Services budget. Then the Svc Co Services cost drastically drop below 1% of the total project budget, and Svc Co Services Budget. Translation costs represented 1.02% (31,076.32 USD) of the total budget. They have been the fifth budget line present in all eight years of implementation, being the other budget lines: Consultant fees, travel costs, Per Diems, and Sundry. Overall, the budget reflects the main objective of the as main spending have been in providing the much-needed infrastructure, as well as the support and capacity building of the beneficiaries.

#### Assessment of Objectives and Outcomes against SMART Criteria

The following marking is used for assessment of the objectives and outcomes.

**Table 4.2: Overview Smart Assessment of Objectives and Outcomes**

| Green: SMART criteria compliant   |  | Yellow: questionably compliant with SMART criteria |   | Red: not compliant with SMART criteria) |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator   | End-of-Project Target  | MTR SMART analysis                                 |   |   |   |   |
|   |  | S  | M | A                                       | R | T |
| Component 2:<br>Outcome 2 (c-Ukraine): HPMP, National Level Capacity Strengthening and HCFC Phase Out Investment) |  | S  | M | A                                       | R | T |
| Formal HCFC Phase-out strategy and action plan developed and endorsed   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Country returns into compliance for the period of 2012-2015 and is able to sustain it;</li><li>HCFC phase-out strategy fully formulated, packaged as draft legislation for Government approval and cleared by line Ministries/department for final endorsement;</li><li>Effective regulatory measures (quotas, etc.) are updated and enforced;</li><li>Inter-agency coordination related to HCFC phase-out is improved;</li><li>Main stakeholders are informed about HCFC phase-out strategy and regulatory measures related to HCFC import and use control:</li></ul> |  |   |   |   |   |



24



25

[illegible]

The Project Results Framework states that the applicable GEF strategic objective and programme for this project is “to protect human health and the environment by assisting countries to phase out consumption and production and prevent releases of ODS according to their commitments to Montreal Protocol phase-out schedules, while enabling low-GHG (Greenhouse Gas) alternative technologies and practices”. However, the objective of protecting health and the environment is nowhere found in the strategy, indicators, baseline nor targets. The Project Results Framework in the project document has a table populated under the following headings. The texts are not being repeated for the sake of brevity as they amount to several pages.

| Project Strategy | Objectively verifiable indicators | Baseline | Target | Sources of verification | Assumptions |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------------------|-------------|
|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------------------|-------------|

**Specificity.** The indicators are clearly defined and describe what the objective is of the project strategy. The regional project indicators and the country specific project indicators are provided in detail.

**Measurability.** Indicators, baseline and targets in the project result framework of the revised project can be seen to be more measurable than the original project results framework. As one example, the output that pertains to increasing the awareness of issues related to Protocol Implementation by government representatives, academic institutions and civil society in the project revision, the target is 50 of these different individuals to have increased their awareness on these issues through relevant activities that the Project conducted. In original project document, in contrast, there is an indicator “information platform on HCFC substitute technologies for ineligible foam manufacturers (PU and XPS) companies”, the baseline was identified as “Key government stakeholders as well as working level officials have limited awareness of HCFC phase-out issue, challenges to address it and skills/tools to enforce HCFC control measures in practice”, among other baseline statements. The corresponding target is “well-informed enforcement stakeholders’ community in addressing HSFC phase-out issue with required level of understanding and technical capacity”, among other statements. While these indicator, baseline measure and target may be verifiable, calibrating the extent of performance may become subjective. Furthermore, there is no one-to-one correspondence between the indicator, baseline, and targets. In the example mentioned, for instance, for one sentence indicator, six baseline statements and six statements for the Target are identified. Other indicators have varying number of baseline statements and Target statements. By setting clearly measurable indicators, corresponding measures and targets can be easily set. However, in instances where an indicator seems complex and seemingly difficult to calibrate, dimensions of that indicator can be established and likewise measured.

**Achievability.** Achievability was for the most part attainable for the project Objectives and the Outcomes, if assumptions on country-ownership/country-driven-ness in the Ukraine were met, but this has not held true and became an increasing challenge as the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine (MENR) had been hesitant to take ownership of the project. With the ongoing institutional changes and challenges, no MoU had been put in place, and the project Mid-term Review identified a general reluctance on the part of the MENR to engage meaningfully with the private sector. This in turn has had implications for private-sector activities, such as i) technician certification and ii) the Centre(s) for Recovery and Recycling of refrigerants, which was a key component of the project after the project restructuring.

It is worth underlining that the achievability element of the project results framework largely depends on the specified assumption of general Government commitment and responsibility, as well as political and institutional stability. Political and economic stability of the country would have been identified as relevant assumption especially that the project required commitment from the manufacturing sector. As reflected in the 2018 project report, “...after political changes, followed the armed conflict unfolded in the Eastern Ukraine and a severe economic crisis which hit the country, the project has only been able to partially implement the planned Investment Programme and Demonstration Projects Component. Majority of previously proposed technical assistance recipients were either physically located in the area of the military conflict and overnight became inaccessible, or subject to bankruptcy...”.

The political and economic instability has impacted both the government’s overall commitment and its commitment to the manufacturing sector, and this has in turn led to significant delays of the project and its subsequent revision and extension. Overall, the indicators are relevant for Ukraine to meet their commitments for HCFC phase-out, particularly without causing any economic disruption and allowing for HCFC using equipment to operate till the end of their useful life.

## 4.3 Project towards Results and Impacts – Review Findings

This section sets out the main findings for Component 2: National Level Capacity Strengthening and HCFC Phase Out Investment, as revised in 2018, as set in the revised project implementation document, are the following:

### ***Outcome 1 – Government of Ukraine adopts and is supported in the implementation of comprehensive strategy for the Montreal Protocol Implementation in Ukraine***

1. **Output 1.1 – Government representatives, academic institutions and civil society have increased awareness of the issues related to the Montreal Protocol:** Given that active engagement by relevant stakeholders and the general public is a requisite for implementing successful activities under an accelerated HCFC Phase-out Schedule, implying raising awareness at all levels to inform target stakeholders and retain their attention through communication and outreach, education, training and TA for the relevant employees of Customs and private sector industries. Those workshops will be led by elected NGOs with the perspective to observe a generally raised awareness on the Montreal Protocol obligations of the GoU and its 2020 HCFC consumption target, and the development of networking for exchange and dissemination of information relative to technological conversion and substance alternatives. Regarding monitoring the achievement of Output 1.1, the quantifiable indicators proposed were the number of government representatives (target 50) and civil society representatives and other relevant stakeholders (target 150) that have an increased awareness on the issues related to the Montreal Protocol Implementation.
2. **Output 1.2 – HCFC monitoring methodology and system are established and produce regular reports to the Ozone Secretariat and key stakeholders<sup>8</sup>:** Problems with HCFC consumption data being reported by the GoU to the Ozone Secretariat emerged during implementation, with the reporting found to be not coherent with the actual HCFC consumption in the country, as country-specific barriers prevent from an overall realistic assessment. Identified contributory factors included consumption of unused surplus of HCFC in the industry, illegal HCFC imports and gaps in the institutional capacity and HCFC licensing system have been pointed out to cause HCFC underreporting to the monitoring institutions. With better training and equipment on identification of HCFCs/HCFs/other ODS alternatives, the stakeholders will be enabled to better report data on national imports, and current and projected use of existing and new ODS alternatives. Through data-sharing via a national web source, more accurate reporting and trends will become a tool for monitoring progress towards HCFC phase-out target and the related action plans of all the stakeholders involved.

### ***Outcome 2 – State Fiscal Services and State Environmental Inspectorate have strengthened capacities to control import/export of ODS and equipment containing the same***

Specialist training was provided to customs specialists to improve HCFC import control during phase 1, but this training was compromised by the necessary equipment, consumables and test samples not being available at that time. It was hence recommended to strengthen the training process by supporting the two identified training institutions, being the State Environmental Academy and Customs Training Academy, in developing a specialised course on the Montreal Protocol Implementation and use of the relevant equipment, as stated in the activities listed below: i) the specialized training courses to be developed upon completion of the reformation of Customs Office in Ukraine; ii) Purchase of auxiliary equipment,

---

<sup>8</sup> The proposed quantifiable indicators for measuring the achievement of Output 1.2 are the availability (yes or no) of ODS and ODS alternative survey in Ukraine, and of an online system for data sourcing and analysis.

consumables, and spare parts; iii) Purchase of pure HCFC test samples for testing and calibration purposes; and iv) Development of a specialized training courses to train customs officials; and v) Training of technicians.

Auxiliary equipment, consumables, and spare parts were procured, in consultation with the Department for Tax and Customs Audit of the State and Fiscal Service, and handed over by the project in September 2019. Regarding HCFC test samples procurement, the purchase of pure HCFC test samples for testing and calibration purposes was not completed as the newly established State Customs Service had not confirmed the technical pure samples specifications<sup>9</sup> and its readiness to accept on its balance after purchase, while the project was not in a position to procure the samples without a written confirmation. Regarding calibration, all equipment has been calibrated. Study tour visits were organised during 2018 for State Fiscal Service representatives to Istanbul Customs Laboratory and Uzbekistan Customs Committee.

The proposed quantifiable indicators for measuring the achievement of Outcome 2 are a scaled evaluation (Scale 0-2 with 0 not used, 1 partially used, 2 fully used) on the extent to which analytical instruments are used to detect ODS by specialists of the State Fiscal Services and State Environmental Inspectorate.

### ***Outcome 3 – Select enterprises in the manufacturing sector implement zero-ODS and low-GWP technologies in their production process***

The deterioration in the political and security situation following Russian intervention meant that the project had to deal with 3 out of 4 of the pilot industries for implementing zero-ODS and low-GWP in their production process facing either bankruptcy or accessibility issues, and thus has to be cancelled. Three new demonstration projects replaced these: i) Finalization of technical conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (water/HCOs/HFOs) at Private Company ‘Polyfoam’; ii) Implementation of blending operation conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (w...) at Private Company ‘Khimpostachalnyk’; and iii) Implementation of a PU foam conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (water/HCOs/HFOs) at VKF Edvans LLC<sup>10</sup>.

### ***Outcome 4 - Demonstration of zero-ODS and low-GWP technology for HCFC phase-out in the servicing sector***

It has been observed that over 60% of HCFC consumption in Ukraine originates from the servicing of existing equipment. The project will target commercial refrigeration appliances as a pilot for demonstrating non-ODS/low-GWP HCFC alternatives, combined with increased energy efficiency, to support the awareness on climate change impact resulting from technological conversion. The program will provide training, technical assistance and funding to help the servicing sector assess and demonstrate use of non-ODS and low-HGH options and help them build technical capacities to retrofit/modernise HCFC based equipment. The proposed quantifiable indicators for measuring the achievement of Outcome 4 are the number of successfully implemented zero-HCFC demonstration projects (target 5) and the number of people who built skills on the implementation of zero-HCFC technologies through demonstration projects.

---

<sup>9</sup> It is understood that letters were sent, but no response had been received by the project end, and it was not possible to verify with the State Customs Service.

<sup>10</sup> The proposed quantifiable indicators for measuring the achievement of Outcome 3 are the progress towards target achievement of 0 metric tons of HCFC consumption in their production process for both PE Khimpostachalnyk and VKF Edvans LLC companies.

### **Progress Towards Objective and Expected Outcomes**

The Final Evaluation assessment and rating are based upon the review of project implementation reports, additional country reports and interviews. Assessments in this table are based on the current end date of the project (that is, not factoring in a no-cost extension).

However, the quantifiable data designated to indicate the level of achievement for each output has not been provided in the project report documentation.

**Table 4.3: Progress Towards Results Matrix (achievement of outcomes against end-of-project targets)**

FEA = Final Evaluation level and assessment - Indicator Assessment Key (Legend):

|              |                              |               |                          |   |
|--------------|------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Green</b> | Achieved                     | <b>Yellow</b> | On target to be achieved | AR = Achievement rating - Progress towards results rating scale: Highly satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately satisfactory (MS); Moderately unsatisfactory (MU) Unsatisfactory (U); Highly unsatisfactory (HU). |
| <b>Red</b>   | Not on target to be achieved |               |                          |   |

| Indicator   | Baseline Level   | Midterm Target | End-of-Project Target   | Cumulative Progress Reported  | FEA          | AR | Justification for Rating  |
|---|--|----------------|---|---|--------------|----|---|
| <b>Objective:</b><br>Finalized and adopted HCFC phase-out strategy and action plan, implementation of national level training for the servicing sector and customs/enforcement authorities, and targeted phase-out investment demonstrations undertaken in priority areas |  |                |   |   |              |    |   |
| HCFC consumption in Ukraine   | 164.20 ODP metric tons   |                | 0.821 ODP metric tons   |   |              |    | No data provided in order to justify achievement of the targets as indicated in Revised ProDoc  |
| <b>Outcome 1</b><br>Government of Ukraine adopts and is supported in the implementation of comprehensive strategy for the Montreal Protocol Implementation in Ukraine   |  |                |   |   |              |    |   |
| <b>Output 1.1</b><br>Government representatives, academic institutions and civil society have increased awareness of the issues related to the Montreal Protocol  | 0 GoU representatives with increased MP Implementation awareness<br><br>0 civil society and relevant stakeholders with increased MP implementation awareness |                | 50 GoU representatives with increased MP Implementation awareness<br><br>150 civil society and relevant stakeholders with increased MP implementation awareness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project provided limited technical support to Academy during 2015-2017</li> <li>Support for Ozone Centre establishment during 2019, within wider civil society cooperation aimed at both awareness raising and ensuring sustainability of project impact post-closure.</li> <li>Awareness raising activities organized, targeting in the main youth, schoolteachers, and general public, and with ctd. targeted outreach activities covering &gt; 10,000 persons.</li> <li>Supported training of a number of professors from key universities in Ukraine to update current knowledge on best RAC practices related to HCFC phase-out and new alternatives</li> </ul> | <b>Green</b> |    | This has been achieved, although some of the end of project targets are rather general (e.g. GoU representatives with increased MP Implementation awareness) and it is not clear that the Ozone Centre is on a sustainable footing. |

| Indicator   | Baseline Level   | Midterm Target | End-of-Project Target  | Cumulative Progress Reported   | FEA    | AR | Justification for Rating   |
|---|--|----------------|--|--|--------|----|--|
| <b>Output 1.2</b> HCFC monitoring methodology and system are established and produce regular reports to the Ozone Secretariat and key stakeholders                            | NO ODS and ODS alternative survey available in Ukraine<br><br>NO online system for data sourcing and analysis available                              |                | YES ODS and ODS alternative survey is available in Ukraine<br><br>YES online system for data sourcing and analysis is available                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project provided support to the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine (2018, Q1 2019) in elaborating the draft law "On ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases"</li> <li>HCFC and HCFC alternatives survey carried out to determine their consumption in Ukraine (years 2017, 2018).</li> <li>Methodology for identification of most used HCFC (R22, R141b, R142b, R406a) was developed from scratch as a particular undertaking within the regional project scope (because the Ukrainian project component was the only among the participating countries who did that).</li> <li>Provision of Expert support to produce annual reports to Ozone Secretariat. Draft law was adopted on first reading, and then second reading and full adoption in Parliament. Application of Framework Law now to be completed with administrative orders.</li> </ul> | Yellow |    | Ongoing  |
| <b>Outcome 2</b><br>State Fiscal Services and State Environmental Inspectorate have strengthened capacities to control import/export of ODS and equipment containing the same |  |                |  |  |        |    |  |
|   | 0 – analytical instruments are not used to detect ODS by specialists of the State Fiscal Services and State Environmental Inspectorate (scale 0 – 2) |                | 2 – analytical instruments are fully used to detect ODS by specialists of the State Fiscal Services and State Environmental Inspectorate (scale 0 – 2) |  |        |    | No reported data related to these indicators.                            |
| <b>Activity 1.</b><br>Specialized training courses to be developed upon completion of the reformation of Customs Office in Ukraine  |  |                |  | Support for the Training Center of the State Fiscal Services (SFS) was provided back in 2015-2016 along with 105 custom specialists trained in 2015 and 30 specialists in 2016, with staff turnover and the late arrival of equipment requiring further training during the extension period.  |        |    | Completed according to project extension phase progress Report 2018-2019 |



| Indicator   | Baseline Level | Midterm Target | End-of-Project Target | Cumulative Progress Reported   | FEA | AR | Justification for Rating   |
|---|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|-----|----|--|
| <b>Activity 2.</b> Purchase of auxiliary equipment, consumables, and spare parts  |                |                |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Auxiliary equipment, consumables, and spare parts for the Customs Service have been purchased and handed over to State Fiscal Service of Ukraine. The Handover protocol (Act of Transfer) was signed on 12 September 2019.</li> <li>Under the initial revision of the project, two (2) gas chromatographs with mass spectrometric detectors (GC-MS) were procured for SFS to enable quantitative analysis of refrigerants. One GC-MS analyser was allocated to the SFS central laboratories in Kiev, the second one was transferred to the SFS branch in Odessa (main port) that deals regularly with bulk ODS shipments</li> </ul> |     |    | Completed according to project extension phase progress Report 2018-2019 |
| <b>Activity 3.</b> Purchase of pure HCFC test samples for testing & calibration purposes  |                |                |                       | As samples can be produced locally using the capacity of Ukrmetrteststandard, there is no further need to organize a complicated procurement process for the test samples.   |     |    | Completed  |
| <b>Activity 4.</b> Development of specialized training courses to train custom officials  |                |                |                       | Pending in view of ongoing (re)-organization of the State Customs Service of Ukraine.  |     |    | Ongoing  |
| <b>Activity 5.</b> Training of technicians and study tour   |                |                |                       | As the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine planned to introduce a system for monitoring the detection of ODS during import of products containing them, a Training Study Tour to Turkish Customs Laboratory was organized for the experts of the SFS Tax and Customs Audit Department in June 2018.  |     |    | Completed according to project extension phase progress Report 2018-2019 |
| <b>Outcome 3</b><br>Select enterprises in the manufacturing sector implement zero-ODS and low-GWP technologies in their production process  |                |                |                       |  |     |    |  |
| <b>Activity 1.</b> Finalization of technical conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (water/HCOs/HFOs) at Private Company "Polyfoam" |                |                |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget for the Polyfoam investment sub-project was increased to include support to all 54 industrial enterprises (Polyfoam's end users).</li> <li>New formulations optimization performed;</li> <li>New formulations application testing completed;</li> <li>Downstream end-users training completed;</li> <li>Safety audits completed;</li> <li>Hand-over protocol signed in March 2019;</li> </ul>  |     |    | Completed according to project extension phase progress Report 2018-2019 |

| Indicator  | Baseline Level  | Midterm Target | End-of-Project Target   | Cumulative Progress Reported  | FEA | AR | Justification for Rating |
|--|---|----------------|---|---|-----|----|--------------------------|
|  |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase-out of 63 metric tons (6.93 ODPt) of HCFC-141b at Polyfoam systems house and its downstream end-user clients achieved.</li> <li>Competitiveness of the Polyfoam Company increased following introduction of the methylal, solcane and water-based systems.</li> <li>Chemical Laboratory Staff of Polyfoam Company is equipped with new knowledge on ozone friendly technologies and is capable to develop new commercial formulation based on non-ODS systems.</li> </ul>  |     |    |                          |
| <b>Activity 2.</b><br>Implementation of blending operation conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (water/HCOs/HFOs) at PE 'Khimpostachalnyk' | 14.90 metric tons HCFC consumption in production process and downstream users |                | 0 metric tons HCFC consumption in production process and downstream users | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reactors upgrade: Revision and replacement of the Raschig Rings (changed to ceramic), Hydrostatic testing conducted.</li> <li>Supply pipes update: Colour coding of pipes implemented, Classification of hazard areas by placards introduced on industrial facility site.</li> <li>Safe methylal storage facility constructed (from scratch): Safety management hardware such as gas detectors, airflow control procured and installed; Leak detectors/emission sensors procured and installed; Fireproof equipment procured and installed.</li> <li>New commercially (economically) viable formulations development and trials completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non ODS spray rigid foam formulation (for thermal isolation for industrial and residential facilities, pipe ducts, and reservoirs) developed and introduced to production cycle;</li> <li>Non ODS formulation for sandwich panels developed and introduced to production cycle;</li> <li>Non ODS formulation for pre-isolated pipes (pipe-in-pipe) developed and introduced to production cycle.<sup>11</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |     |    | Completed                |
| <b>Activity 3.</b><br>Implementation of PU foam conversion to water/HCOs/ HFOs (non-ODS /very low GWP blowing agent) at 'VKF Edvans' LLC             | 18 metric tons HCFC consumption usage in production process                   |                | 0 metric tons HCFC consumption usage in production process                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company and BASF Polyurethanes GmbH organized a seminar to demonstrate the use of new auxiliary blowing agents (HFOs) in the PU industry.</li> <li>Technical documentation and state certification tests developed based on the Ukrainian legislation</li> <li>The company has eliminated the use of HCFC-141b</li> </ul>  |     |    |                          |

<sup>11</sup> Update on Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region February – June 2020- Page 1

| Indicator   | Baseline Level  | Midterm Target | End-of-Project Target   | Cumulative Progress Reported  | FEA | AR | Justification for Rating          |
|---|---|----------------|---|---|-----|----|-----------------------------------|
|   |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customers Conversion: Materials for trials procured; Trials completed; Test instruments procured; Technical documentation development launched;<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>  |     |    |                                   |
| <b>Outcome 4</b>  |   |                |   |   |     |    |                                   |
| Demonstration of zero-ODS and low-GWP technology for HCFC phase-out in the servicing sector |   |                |   |   |     |    |                                   |
|   | 0 successfully implemented zero-HCFC demo projects<br>0 people who built skills on the implementation of zero-HCFC technologies through demo projects |                | 5 successfully implemented zero-HCFC demonstration projects<br><br>(for development) people who built skills on the implementation of zero-HCFC technologies through demonstration projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project follow-up concept paper for “Complete HCFC Phase-Out in Ukraine through Promotion of zero ODS low GWP Energy Efficient Technologies” addressing RAC sector.</li> <li>Site identification for potential pilot projects was conducted, also technical specifications have been developed and agreed with pilot sites.</li> <li>Potential vendors have been identified thanks to a market research conducted.</li> <li>Vendors will do the retrofit which will be completed at the end of the timeframe<sup>13</sup></li> </ul> |     |    | No measurable data were provided. |

<sup>12</sup> Update on Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region February – June 2020- Page 2

<sup>13</sup> Update on Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region February – June 2020- Page 3

## 5 LESSONS LEARNED

This section sets learning, points for reflection and lessons that can be learned from the project implementation:

- a. **Opportunities to promote gender mainstream and advance gender equality:** While some specific sectors and roles (e.g., RAC service technicians) have restrictions that restrict some opportunities for women<sup>14</sup>, some of the Ukraine's implementation experience, as well as that of the wider regional project, shows that there are opportunities to mainstream gender and advance gender equality in HCFC phase out work. Some of the educational institutions participating in the regional project, for example, appointed gender advisors to allow them to better take gender-related issues into consideration, while UNDP IRH created a special gender-related award window in the photo contest Women & Ozone Layer.
- b. **Implementation:** As seen, a series of significant implementation challenges have severely constrained project progress, and led in part to the 'decoupling' of the project implementation has been severely constrained by a range of challenges. The lack of sufficient high-level political commitment and leadership from the Government of Ukraine and the constant changing of governments and ministerial appointments has been particularly damaging, depriving the project of steady high-level commitment and continuity of that commitment. Other constraints have included overly bureaucratic implementation environment at the primary beneficiary Ministry for Ecology and Natural Resources, and none of these issues have been significantly addressed or mitigated by the project.
- c. **Project management:** Project management performance on UNDP's side appears mixed. At specific periods in the project, there has been a poor choice of project manager (or at the least a lack of management oversight of specific partner relationships and communications skills deficits) and a resultant deterioration in relations with the primary beneficiary Ministry. It should be emphasised that the above project management and partner engagement deficits stand in contrast to the commitment and dedication of other members of the UNDP project team who continued to try to progress implementation in what was a distinctly challenging implementation environment, and under the new UNDP Country Office management there is determination to rebuild the relationship and to learn from this project implementation experience. There have also been strong aspects to the project management, not least in the selection and support of outstanding experts to implement the company demonstration projects.
- d. **Implementation challenges and learning:** It is difficult to completely understand why the project has had so many delays, or at least to weigh the contribution of a range of contributing factors. Nonetheless, key project stakeholders need to reflect on this and ask if they could have done better, or at least differently.

---

<sup>14</sup> An example is Tajikistan, where work regulations are in place that protect women from carrying heavy items at work and thus stop women from taking up employment as RAC service technicians.

- i. For UNDP Country Office, oversight of unsatisfactory project management and partner communication was not sufficiently monitored and addressed in a timely manner, leading to an adverse impact on the relationship with the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine, as well as impact on other dedicated UNDP project staff working on the project. Going forward, the UNDP Country Office needs to have a more effective oversight and faster reaction, while also ensuring there is an ongoing high-level communication channel with Ministry leadership. Secondly, in an implementation context where ownership and capacity on the counterpart side were weak, it is worth asking of this implementation approach was the most appropriate, and whether for example, an alternative approach such as a Technical Assistance team or project management unit inside the ministry might have proved more effective?
- ii. Notwithstanding the challenging implementation environment, UNDP IRH may want to reflect on whether IRH could (or should) have acted more decisively to address implementation challenges as it became clear that Ukraine was starting to fall behind? That said, under this implementation modality, it is not that clear how much could have been done, although a mix of a threat of reallocation of some national budget allocation and external expert support placed inside the counterpart Ministry might have been worth trying.
- iii. For the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine, there needs to be reflection on how to better manage the demands of project management and implementation in a rather bureaucratic and overly activity-focussed institutional culture, where despite the dedication of under-resourced staff internal work processes, bureaucracy and an overly hierarchical culture make it difficult to work to the demands and rhythm of an international project.
- iv. As an example, it may want to reflect on setting up a dedicated project management centre inside the Ministry with a set-up to all it to better cater for the demands of this kind of project.

## 6 REVIEW CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS



### Section Guide

*This section provides an overview of the following:*

- *Evaluation Conclusions (6.1)*
- *Evaluation Ratings (6.2)*
- *Evaluation Recommendations (6.4)*

### 6.1 Final Evaluation Conclusions

The final evaluation conclusions are set out below. Each conclusion (C) is numbered.

- 10. C1 - Relevance:** The project was evaluated relevant to the Ukrainian context in the way that it provided the necessary assistance in terms of funding, guidance and staffing to the unit on ozone depletion of the MENR to comply with the Montreal Protocol obligations. Without such support, the interviewees testify that the progress accomplished would not have been feasible.
- 11. C2 – Project Design:** The project has been highly relevant to the Ukraine’s context and needs given its requirement under the Protocol to phase-out of production and consumption in 2020, Furthermore, as well as providing support to Ukraine set limitations in regulation of HCFC consumption, strengthen Ukraine’s national capacity to control HCFC imports, and strengthening of licensing systems and introduction HCFC monitoring. Similarly, it provided support to address capacity needs in various state agencies, such as the State Customs Service required in order to allow effective monitoring of HCFC imports and HFCFC end-use.
- 12. C3 - Implementation challenges:** Project implementation has been severely constrained by a range of challenges. This has included the change in the geo-political environment, over which the project had no control, but even more important has been the lack of sufficient high-level political engagement and leadership from the Government of Ukraine, significant political instability and constantly changing Ministerial appointments which have deprived the project of steady high-level commitment and continuity of that commitment. Other constraints have included overly bureaucratic implementation environment at the primary beneficiary Ministry for Ecology and Natural Resources, and none of these issues have been significantly addressed or mitigated by the project. Going forward, it is imperative that any future success initiative derives credible solutions and mitigation measures to address, or at least manage, these issues.
- 13. Effectiveness.** The overall effectiveness of the project was affected by a series of challenges, including insufficient governmental capacity, lack of country ownership and leadership, and by technological and

operational challenges, creating delays in the completion of the project objectives. This severely slowed down delivery of project activities, which was further exacerbated by weak project management during at least two intervals in the project. Notwithstanding the challenges, there has been however a relatively significant level of completion of project activities and outputs, even if these have been realised in a much-prolonged timeframe compared to the original regional project. Examples are some of the capacity development and equipment procurement and supply for the State Customs Service, the support to drafting the Framework Law, the interest generated in the Call for Proposals, and the work done on the conversion demonstration projects. All of these activities, and others, have generated praise from government stakeholders during the stakeholder interviews, and appreciation of UNDP support under the project. The quality of advice and support provided by the international conversion experts, in a challenging implementation context, was one area of excellence, even if the learning and follow-up expected from a demonstration project was not maximised afterwards.

- 14. Efficiency.** Many operational and administrative issues have come in the way of the efficiency of the project, such as insufficient governmental capacity leading to the adoption of a legislation with lessened impact and inability to accurately report HCFC consumption data at the country-level preventing the relevant stakeholders from monitoring their progress towards success and planning their actions accordingly. Even if many of the project actions were completed, the implementation challenges mentioned above have significantly comprised the overall efficiency of the project, when one compares the time required for completion compared to the implementation timeframe of the other regional project member countries, and this has represented a significant opportunity cost for the Ukraine.
- 15. Progress to Impact.** The project extension has enabled Ukraine to achieve a majority of its intended outputs, and some of its impacts, such as the adoption of a Law on Ozone Depleting substances, the implementation of three major contracts for ODS conversion, and the supply of equipment for ODS detection training and increased awareness among its stakeholders. While some actions require some extra steps to be taken to reach full completion, the lack of country ownership and leadership, a highly bureaucratic implementation environment and a lack of engagement of all stakeholders means that progress towards impact is less than what would be expected based on the level of completion of project activities and outputs. Furthermore, the Call for Proposals also generated real interest and showed what might have been possible with a more open engagement of all actors, in particular the private sector and civil society, had been pursued by MENR.
- 16. Sustainability:** Overall, the project has registered mixed results in terms of sustainability, with regard to the financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, and environmental aspects of sustainability. Regarding the policy and regulatory level, the new framework law provides represents an important milestone, although it will require administrative orders to be enforced, while the legislative documents on the broader non-ODS regulations adopted must be completed with sub-regulations on HCFC for adequately supporting the implementation of the MP in Ukraine, while ratification of the Kigali Amendment by the Parliament of Ukraine is also pending<sup>15</sup>. Another positive is

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.k-cep.org/wp-content/themes/kigali/page-templates/map/MapRatification.html>

that there is some level of raised awareness among relevant stakeholders and the public about ozone depletion and the importance of phase out work in respect of ODS, even if level of increase is somewhat difficult to measure. However, institutional arrangements are not in place for effective consultation and involvement of all relevant stakeholders, nor is a clear strategy for going forward is not in place, nor a costing and financial plan and how financial sustainability could be optimised.

- 17. Country ownership.** Country ownership has been inadequate, in significant part due to the political environment of Ukraine during the project's implementation period, leading to frequent change of stakeholders (ministers, focal points) and of the level of authority of the main institution (MENR merging with MONE in 2019, then separating in 2020). Moreover, there has been a lack of co-ordination with relevant government and non-government stakeholders, and in particular with the private sector,
- 18. Gender equality and women's empowerment.** There has been no specific mention of integration of gender equality and women's empowerment component in the project results, although some aspects of the project have had above-average participation of women. However, there is scope for a more systematic approach to mainstreaming gender.

## 6.2 Evaluation Ratings

The table below sets out the evaluation ratings:

*Table 6.1 - Evaluation Ratings Table*

| Evaluation Ratings:            |           |   |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation   | rating    | 2. IA& EA Execution                           | rating    |
| M&E design at entry            | <b>S</b>  | Quality of UNDP Implementation                | <b>MU</b> |
| M&E Plan Implementation        | <b>S</b>  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency       | <b>MU</b> |
| Overall quality of M&E         | <b>MU</b> | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | <b>U</b>  |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes      | rating    | 4. Sustainability                             | Rating    |
| Relevance                      | <b>HS</b> | Financial resources:                          | <b>U</b>  |
| Effectiveness                  | <b>S</b>  | Socio-political:                              | <b>U</b>  |
| Efficiency                     | <b>MU</b> | Institutional framework and governance:       | <b>MU</b> |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | <b>MU</b> | Environmental:                                | <b>MU</b> |
|                                |           | Overall likelihood of sustainability:         | <b>MU</b> |



## 6.3 Final Evaluation Recommendations

The final evaluation recommendations are set out below. In total there are 7 recommendations elaborated, as summarised below:

| No. | Recommendation Summary (Title)  | Addressed To                                  |
|-----|---|---|
| R1  | Develop a transition project of targeted post-project actions to boost visibility of results and ensure continuity                      | UNDP CO                                       |
| R2  | Carry out rapid feasibility work to relaunch a national Ozone Centre  | UNDP (with support requested from Government) |
| R3  | Formulate a transition project with the aim of supporting the development of a credible national strategy                               | UNDP CO, UNDP IRH, MENR, Other Ministries     |
| R4  | Develop credible and workable implementation arrangements for implementing a national strategy  | MENR, Other Ministries                        |
| R5  | Develop a gender mainstreaming and gender promotion strategy and action plan for post-project actions and transition projects           | UNDP, MENR                                    |
| R6  | Consider setting up a dedicated project management centre within the Ministry to improve project management and implementation delivery | MENR  |
| R7  | Put practices in place in UNDP CO to ensure improved dialogue with leadership of counterpart Ministries.                                | UNDP CO                                       |

The detailed recommendations are set out below:

| R1   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Develop a transition project of targeted post-project actions to boost visibility of results and ensure continuity</b>  |  |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that a transition project of targeted post-project actions to boost visibility of results and ensure continuity, and thereby avoid any complete loss of momentum. Targeted actions that could be considered could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited targeted communications action on results achieved by the project could be considered, including capacity building activities, company demonstration projects, with a view to preparing for a post-project phase once a national strategy is developed. This could, if deemed appropriate, included a limited press conference or similar event.</li> <li>• Specific profiling of the conversion work under the company demonstration projects, and wider communication to specific industries, including involvement of representative industry and sectoral bodies.</li> <li>• An initial, small-scale round-table discussion including Government, UNDP and private sector stakeholders on project results, lessons learned and recommendations for going forward..</li> </ul> |  |

|                                     |                               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>R1</b>                           |                               |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b> | UNDP, Government of Ukraine   |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>    | February 2021 – December 2021 |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>R2</b>   |   |
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Carry out rapid feasibility work to relaunch a national Ozone Centre</b>   |   |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> It is not clear that the Ozone Centre has achieved a satisfactory level of development or sustainability. Furthermore, it is doubtful that the Ozone Centre can fulfil its potential and exert maximum impact from being located inside the Government.</p> <p>It is recommended that the current situation be reviewed, with a view to relaunching the Ozone Centre on an independent funding, with one of its mandates being to be a vector for increasing public awareness, understanding, knowledge and</p> <p>This review and rapid feasibility work should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determining its mandate</li> <li>• Carrying out feasibility work on its structure and funding</li> <li>• Developing a sustainable funding model and plan</li> <li>• Looking at good practice, ideas and experience from other countries, including but not restricted to the regional project countries.</li> </ul> <p>A (recommended) important part of the work of the Centre could be to co-implement a transition period of actions (under Recommendation 1 above) to boost the visibility of this project's results and ensure continuity.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the Government show its commitment to a relaunched centre by not only supporting this work, but also considering if it could help reduce costs by providing an under-used public building that could house the centre. Such a gesture would also be a positive signal from the Government to move to an accelerated phase out effort with real involvement of non-state actors, and in particular the private sector, in a much more public-private partnership ethos.</p> |   |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b>   | UNDP, (with support request from the Government of Ukraine) |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>  | February 2021 – June 2021                                   |

| R3   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Provide support for the development of a credible national strategy, as part a post-project transition period</b>   |  |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that UNDP and the project stakeholders consider a short-term transition project to orchestrate and support the process of developing a comprehensive national strategy and phase-out plan. There is no strategy current in place, and the project implementation has also been overly focussed on the environmental dimension of HFCFC phase-out, with insufficient focus on business and industry considerations, and a lack of meaningful involvement of private sector stakeholders. Such support for, and work on, developing a national strategy will also require action by the Government to prepare workable implementation arrangements for any future strategy implementation effort, to ensure the learning from this project is taken up.</p> |  |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b>  | UNDP, All Relevant Ministries (including Cabinet of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources, Ministry of Strategic Industries, Ministry for Infrastructure) |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>   | February 2021 – March 2021   |

| R4  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Develop credible and workable implementation arrangements for implementing a national strategy</b>   |  |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> Closely linked to the above recommendation on the development of a comprehensive national strategy, particular attention needs to be devoted to national implementation arrangements, and any work on developing/preparing workable implementation arrangements needs to go in tandem with work on the development of a national strategy. The level of political change and institutional transition over the lifetime of this past project means that it is appears neither realistic nor credible to base operation implementation for a national strategy inside a government ministry. Instead, it is recommended that a set-up has to be developed that allows the government to play the important supporting role that will be required, but with independent operational implementation outside of government structures that will be not be impacted by government and institutional changes.</p> <p>This should include exploring, inter alia, the following with such future implementation arrangement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A representative national commission/committee</li> <li>• Enjoying political endorsement but not directly dependent on national ministry (ministries)</li> <li>• Identification of distinct role for Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources</li> <li>• Real inter-ministerial and inter-institutional collaboration</li> </ul> |  |

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>R4</b>                           |  |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b> | Government of Ukraine (including Cabinet of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources, Ministry of Strategic Industries, Ministry for Infrastructure) |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>    | February 2021 – June 2021  |

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>R5</b>   |                           |
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Develop a gender mainstreaming and gender promotion strategy and action plan for post-project actions and transition projects.</b>   |                           |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> The Ukraine project implementation (and wider regional implementation) that while gender was not prioritised in this project, that there are nonetheless opportunities to promote gender mainstream and advance gender equality. It is recommended that for any transition project developed, along with any or initiative that a full gender mainstreaming is carried out, as well as a gender promotion strategy and action plan to promote gender equality in the sector, including for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting gender-sensitive messages in any post-project communications and awareness-raising campaign</li> <li>• Showcasing gender-related success stories. etc.</li> <li>• Etc.</li> </ul> |                           |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b>   | UNDP Country Office,      |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>  | February 2021 – June 2021 |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>R6</b>  |  |
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Consider setting up a dedicated project management centre within the Ministry to improve project management and implementation delivery.</b>  |  |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> As seen, a series of significant implementation challenges have severely constrained project progress, and led in part to the ‘decoupling’ of the project implementation has been severely constrained by a range of challenges, with one of these constraints have included overly bureaucratic implementation environment at the primary beneficiary Ministry for Ecology and Natural Resources, and none of these issues have been significantly addressed or mitigated by the project of government structures that will be not be impacted by government and institutional changes.</p> <p>This should include exploring, inter alia, the following with such future implementation arrangement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided dedicated and trained project managers, that can co-ordinate inputs from Ministry staff on an as-needs and ad-hoc basis.</li> <li>• Ensure a more results-oriented implementation approach to project implementation</li> </ul> |  |

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>R6</b>                           |  |
|                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened inter-ministerial and inter-institutional collaboration</li> </ul> |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b> | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources   |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>    | February 2021 – June 2021  |

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| <b>R7</b>  |                       |
| <b>Recommendation Summary: Put practices in place in UNDP CO to ensure improved dialogue with leadership of counterpart Ministries.</b>  |                       |
| <p><b>Detailed Recommendation:</b> The project implementation suffered at a number of junctures from sub-standard management, communication and engagement with the primary beneficiary ministry. While people selection and performance prediction are never an exact science, it is not clear why UNDP's CO management did not pick up on this earlier. At the very least, UNDP should seek to organise period high-level meetings with Ministry leadership counterparts, to listen and dialogue and understand. This could be a mix of formal meetings, as well as more informal settings such as a working lunch or dinner, and will help Ministry leadership to see that regarding of difficulties or project implementation challenges that the relationship is important and valued on UNDP's side.</p> |                       |
| <b>Recommendation Addressed to:</b>  | UNDP Country Office   |
| <b>Implementation Timeframe:</b>   | February 2021 onwards |

## 7 ANNEXES

### 7.1 Annex I: Evaluation Bibliography

1. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region:** Project Document.
2. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Ukraine Part):** Substantive Revision to the project Document
3. **Guidance for Conducting Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.**
4. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan):** Terminal Evaluation.
5. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan):** Mid-Term Review.
6. **UNDP DE Guidance Virtual Evaluations during COVID-19 June 2020**
7. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region:** Project Implementation Review-2017.
8. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region:** Project Implementation Review-2018.
9. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region:** Project Implementation Review-2019
10. **Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Ukraine Component Extension):** Review of progress reports for the project
11. **Interview Notes** collected for the Terminal Evaluation 2020
12. **Update on Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in Ukraine** February 2020 – June 2020
13. Progress Reports

14. Combined Delivery Report - 2014
15. Combined Delivery Report – 2016
16. Combined Delivery Report – 2016
17. Combined Delivery Report – 2017
18. Combined Delivery Report – 2018
19. Combined Delivery Report – 2019
20. Project Budget Revision 11 November 2019
21. BASF Blowing agents for Spray Polyurethane Foam, BASF Performance Materials, February 2020
22. BASF New Spray Foam Generation, In-situ Spray PU Rigid Foam, BASF Performance Materials, February 2020
23. UNDP Project Ukraine – PolyFoam - Status Summary, October 2017
24. UNDP Polyfoam - Parameter Record
25. UNDP Training - Polyurethane Foam Formulations - Science and Technology

## 7.2 Annex II: List of Stakeholders Consulted

| No. | Name               | Position  | Organisation/Department   |
|-----|--------------------|---|---|
| 1   | Maksim Surkov      | Senior Technical Advisor for the Montreal Protocol                          | UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub  |
| 2   | Manal Fouani       | Deputy Resident Representative  | UNDP Ukraine Country Office   |
| 3   | Bert Veenendaal    | International Consultant  | Project Team  |
| 4   | Brian Fogg         | International Consultant – Senior Expert in Polyurethane Formulations       | Project Team  |
| 5   | Anatoliy Gamera    | Lead Expert on building national capacity for HCFC phase-out                | Project Team  |
| 6   | Maryna Dyachenko   | Grants Coordinator  | Project Team  |
| 7   | Rimma Kushtym      | Junior Legal Consultant   | Project Team  |
| 8   | Andriy Glebov      | Consultant on development of the methodology for R406a identification       | Project Team  |
| 9   | Serhiy Stenin      | Department of Examinations and Research of Chemical and Industrial Products | State Customs Service   |
| 10  | Viacheslav Zghuria | Consultant on development of the methodology for R142 identification        | Project Team  |
| 11  | Roman Shakhmatenko | National Legal Consultant – Draft Law on protection of the ozone layer      | Project Team  |
| 12  | Nina Pashchenko    | Project Assistant   | Project Team  |
| 13  | Iryna Stavchuk     | Deputy Minister   | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine |



| No. | Name                | Position  | Organisation/Department   |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|
| 14  | Viktor Vakarash     | Former Deputy Minister<br>Former Director, Specialized Laboratory, State Fiscal Service of Ukraine  | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine State Fiscal Service of Ukraine |
| 15  | Svitlana Grynychuk  | Former Director of Climate Change and Ozone Layer Protection Department   | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine                                 |
| 16  | Valentyna Vasylenko | Head of Department for environmental monitoring, audit and technical regulation of the Directorate for environmental monitoring and atmospheric air | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine                                 |
| 17  | Oleksandr Bondar    | Rector of the State Ecological Academy of Post – Graduate Education and Management  | State Ecological Academy  |
| 18  | Valeriy Voznyi      | Co-ordinator  | All Ukrainian Union of Refrigeration  |
| 19  | Viktor Chupilko     | Director of the LLC “Polyfoam”  | Polyfoam, Ltd   |
| 20  | Andriy Ostraukhov   | Director of PE “Khimpostachalnyk”   | PE Khimpostachalnyk Company   |
| 21  | Volodymyr Kozoriz   | Director of LLC “VKF Edvans”  | Advance Company   |
| 22  | Mykola Kuzio        | Former Deputy Director for European Integration   | Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine                                 |
|     |                     |   |   |

## 7.3 Annex III: Final Evaluation Framework

The Final Evaluation framework and evaluation questions are set out below:

### Overview Evaluation Questions

| No.                               | Evaluation Question  | Data Collection Methods  |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| <i>Project Design/Formulation</i> |  |  |
| 1                                 | To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?  | Desk Research<br>Stakeholder interviews  |
| 2                                 | Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal, objectives and intended impacts and effects?   | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews<br>Analysis and synthesis of post-field interviews |
| 3                                 | How were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?  | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews<br>Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews    |
| 4                                 | What were the planned stakeholder interactions, as set out in the project document Stakeholder Engagement Plan?  | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews  |
| 5                                 | How were gender considerations integrated in the project's design, including through a gender analysis with the specific context of the project for advancing gender equality and women's empowerment and a gender action plan with a specific implementation plan for the delivery of gender activities, with indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party? | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews<br>Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews    |
| <i>Project Implementation</i>     |  |  |

| No.   | Evaluation Question  | Data Collection Methods  |
|---|--|--|
| 6   | What significant changes did the project undergo as a result of recommendations from the Mid-Term Review, or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications. (Consider presenting the MTR recommendations, management responses to the recommendations, and TE team comments in a table format.) | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews  |
| 7   | How did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? How did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?   | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews  |
| 8   | Whether strong financial controls were established to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables;   | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews<br>Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews          |
| <b><i>Project Results and Impacts-Effectiveness</i></b>     |  |  |
| 9   | To what extent the envisaged partnerships in the implementation of the project have been effective in the expected achievements in the country?  | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews<br>Analysis and synthesis post-field interviews          |
| 10  | What have been the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?   | Desk research (NB project reporting)<br>Stakeholder interviews                                   |
| <b><i>Project Results and Impacts- Efficiency</i></b>       |  |  |
| 11  | Have the project's actions to-date to achieve the outputs and expected outcomes been timely, effective and efficient (including cost-efficiency and w.r.t any implementation alternatives)?  | Desk research (including review of implementation guidance and advice)<br>Stakeholder interviews |
| 12  | To what extent has the project managed to provide implementation guidance and advice on the delivery of the focus country activities?  | Desk research (including review of implementation guidance and advice)<br>Stakeholder interviews |
| <b><i>Project Results and Impacts- GEF Additionally</i></b> |  |  |
| 13  | Do monitoring and evaluation documents provide evidence of the causality between the rationale for GEF involvement and the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF-supported project?  | Desk research (including review of implementation guidance and advice)<br>Stakeholder interviews |

| No.  | Evaluation Question   | Data Collection Methods   |
|--|---|---|
| 14   | Are there quality quantitative and verifiable data demonstrating the incremental environmental benefits?  | Desk research (including review of implementation guidance and advice)<br>Stakeholder interviews                    |
| <b><i>Project Results and Impacts-Progress towards Objective and Expected Outcomes</i></b> |   |   |
| 15   | To what extent has the project managed to achieve a development impact through the targeted capacity building of public, private, business development and social stakeholders, and development impact achieved can reasonably be attributed to, or be associated to the project? | Desk research (including comparison delivery of activities and outcomes against planning)<br>Stakeholder interviews |
| 16   | To what extent is the experience, impact, best practices and lessons learnt at the country and regional levels fed into national and international dialogue on the low carbon development for an enhanced global impact of similar project on Sustainable Development?            | Desk research<br>Stakeholder interviews (primarily)   |
| 17   | What has happened (to-date) as a result of the project and what real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries (including no. persons impacted)?  | Desk research (where reported in project reporting and tracking)<br>Stakeholder interviews                          |
| 18   | How can the programme leverage existing partnerships with relevant continental institutions in ways that better coordinate efforts, minimize duplications and scale up impact?  | Desk research (including comparison other initiatives)<br>Stakeholder interviews                                    |
| <b><i>Project Results and Impacts-Sustainability prospects</i></b>                         |   |   |
| 19   | To what extent are the results sustainable? Will the outputs lead to benefits beyond the lifespan of the first phase of the project particularly in the country?  | Desk research (analysis of impacts and contributory and sustaining factors)<br>Stakeholder interviews               |
| 20   | How has the project been able to build sustainable capacity in the country in ways that would outlast the project?  | Stakeholder interviews<br>Overall analysis (post-field interviews)  |

| No. | Evaluation Question  | Data Collection Methods  |
|-----|--|--|
| 21  | What is the likelihood that financial resources will be available once the GEF assistance ends to support the continuation of benefits (income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes)? | Stakeholder interviews<br>Overall analysis (post-field interviews)   |
| 22  | What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?  | Desk research (NB implementation-influencing factors, challenges etc.)<br>Stakeholder interviews<br>Overall analysis (post-field interviews) |

## 7.4 Annex IV: Stakeholder Interview Questionnaire

The stakeholder interview questions are set out below:

### *Stakeholder Interview Questions*

|           | E-Interview Guide – Questions  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>I</b>  | <b>Project Relevance &amp; Design</b>  |
| 1         | <b>Introductory:</b> What is your role and what is your connection to the project?<br>a. E.g., in which project activities have you been involved?   |
| 2         | <b>Relevance:</b> What has been the relevance of the Ukraine national project to<br>a. National Ukrainian context at project launch?<br>b. Validity to Ukrainian context today?<br>c. Your own needs/work as a [stakeholder] – if applicable?  |
| 3         | <b>Project Design:</b> How would you assess the design of the Ukraine national project?<br>a. Consistency of project activities and outputs with the overall objectives and intended impacts?<br>b. Feasibility of project components with timeframe?<br>c. Incorporation of gender?   |
| <b>II</b> | <b>Project Implementation</b>  |
| 4         | <b>Implementation Challenges:</b> What have been the biggest challenges experienced in project implementation?<br>a. Delays in implementation?<br>b. Barriers faced?<br>c. Other?  |
| 5         | What significant changes were made following the MTR recommendations? (or as a result other review procedures)?  |
| 6         | <b>Stakeholder and partner involvement and engagement:</b> How has the project performed with regard to involvement and engagement with stakeholders and partners?<br>a. Involvement of/support from government stakeholders for the project?<br>b. Active role in project decision-making?<br>c. Adequacy/effectiveness of communication with external stakeholders<br>d. Level of country ownership? |

|     | E-Interview Guide – Questions  |
|-----|--|
| 7   | <b>Project management:</b> How do you assess overall project management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Project planning and management</li> <li>b. Risk identification and mitigation</li> <li>c. Financial management (incl. timely flow of funds, payments)</li> <li>d. Project monitoring</li> <li>e. Project communication</li> <li>f. Project reporting</li> </ul>   |
| 8   | <b>Adaptive management:</b> How has the project been able to adapt to challenges/realities as they emerged? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Risks anticipated?</li> <li>b. Risks/challenges not foreseen?</li> </ul>   |
| III | <b>Effectiveness</b>   |
| 9.  | What is the level of the project progress towards results? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Progress by component</li> <li>b. Main factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of project objectives?</li> <li>c. Degree to which actions to-date have achieved the outputs and expected outcomes in a timely and cost-efficient manner?</li> <li>d. Degree of implementation guidance and advice from project on the delivery of the focus country activities?</li> </ul> |
| IV  | <b>Impact, Sustainability and Learning</b>   |
| 10  | <b>Impact:</b> What have been the most significant impacts of the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Main impacts (e.g., what has happened (to-date) as a result of the project and what real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries)</li> <li>b. Scale of impact (e.g., no. persons impacted)?</li> <li>c. Indirect impacts/multiplier impacts?</li> <li>d. Constraints to impact?</li> </ul>  |
| 11  | <b>Sustainability:</b> To what extent are the project results and impact sustainable? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Sustainability prospects (policy/regulatory)?</li> <li>b. Sustainability prospects (environmental)?</li> <li>c. Sustainability prospects (financial)?</li> <li>d. Options/actions needed to improve sustainability?</li> <li>e. Risks to be managed</li> </ul>   |

|    | E-Interview Guide – Questions  |
|----|--|
| 12 | <b>Learning:</b> What have been the mains lessons learned/learning points from the project implementation? |



## 7.5 Annex V: Final Evaluation Terms of Reference

### Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Project name:</b>                              | Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Ukraine Part)  |
| <b>Post title:</b>                                | International Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Ukraine National component of UNDP-GEF project Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region |
| <b>Type of contract:</b>                          | Individual Contract (IC)  |
| <b>Assignment type:</b>                           | International Consultant  |
| <b>Country / Duty Station:</b>                    | Home Based (remote)   |
| <b>Expected places of travel (if applicable):</b> | n/a (COVID-19 pandemic restrictions)  |
| <b>Languages required:</b>                        | English, knowledge of Ukrainian (or Russian) is an asset  |
| <b>Starting date of assignment:</b>               | 1 August 2020 – 30 September 2020   |
| <b>Duration of Contract:</b>                      | 15 working days spread over a two months period   |
| <b>Duration of Assignment:</b>                    | 15 working days spread over a two months period   |
| <b>Payment arrangements:</b>                      | Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)   |
| <b>Administrative arrangements:</b>               | The consultant is responsible for any equipment and other materials needed for the assignment.  |
| <b>Evaluation method:</b>                         | Cumulative score, ICs were previously assessed by ACP   |
| <b>Application deadline:</b>                      | 17 July 2019  |

***Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.***

#### INTRODUCTION

---

In accordance with UNDP and GEF Monitoring & Evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal

evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Ukraine's national component of the full-sized project titled *"Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)"* (PIMS 4309) implemented through the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, and UNDP Country Offices in respective partner countries. The project was designed to respond to the obligations incurred by participating countries (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) under their respective HCFC phase out schedules under the Montreal Protocol. The project was designed to improve regulatory measures to help address the accelerated HCFC phase-out in the medium and longer term, and to strengthen the preparedness for the complete phase-out of HCFCs from current use. The project document was designed to address the following two main components (regional and national):

- Component 1 (Regional information exchange and networking component), addressing barriers associated with incomplete knowledge and awareness and which is aligned with PIF Component 1; Outcomes 1(a-d) - the component to be implemented on UNDP regional level (initially out of UNDP Bratislava Regional Center, and later on from a new UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub);
- Component 2 (National capacity building and technical assistance component), targeting support to the adoption of the fully completed HCFC phase-out strategy (with selected legislative options to control HCFC import/use), capacity building and supply of analytical and servicing equipment/tools for the Environmental Inspectorate and Customs Departments and refrigeration technicians, technological conversions for solvents and rigid foams, modernization of HCFC re-use scheme in the country and demonstration of alternative technologies in refrigeration equipment and A/C sectors, pilot small-scale ODS destruction.

The national components for Belarus and Tajikistan were operationally closed in early 2017 and the component for Uzbekistan reached completion of its activities as of 31 July 2018. In Ukraine, regional Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT region project activities planned under Component-1 were successfully concluded within the above extension period. But activities planned under Component-2 were only partially complete till that date. In view of delayed implementation, the national component for Ukraine was further subject to a substantive revision approved at the Project Board meeting held on 27 April 2018 and an additional no-cost until 31 July 2020 approved by UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.

The Regional and National components have been evaluated, while this additional evaluation aimed at update of the data on Ukraine in the main terminal evaluation report by annexing the current report. Therefore, this assignment envisages only evaluation of post revision extension Ukrainian National component of UNDP-GEF project Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region Project Summary Table.

Project  
Title:

Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region

|                          |   |  |                               |                              |
|--------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| GEF Project ID:          | 4309  |  | at endorsement (Million US\$) | at completion (Million US\$) |
| UNDP Project ID:         | 66300   | GEF financing:                         | 3.19 (Ukraine`s component)    | 3.19 (Ukraine`s component)   |
| Country:                 | Ukraine   | IA/EA own:                             | 0                             | 0                            |
| Region:                  | Europe and CIS  | Government:                            | 1,35                          | 0                            |
| Focal Area:              | Ozone Layer Depletion   | Other:                                 | 9,56                          | 0                            |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  | Government adopts policy frameworks and mechanisms to ensure reversal of environmental degradation; climate change mitigation and adaptation; and prevention of and response to natural and human-caused disasters. |  |                               |                              |
| Executing Agency:        | UNDP  | Total Project Cost:                    | 3.19 (* as per ProDoc)        |                              |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Environmental Protection  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |                               | 29.05.2013                   |
|                          |   | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed: 31.07.2020          | Actual: 31.07.2020           |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | and Natural<br>Resource of<br>Ukraine of<br>Ukraine<br>State Fiscal<br>Service of<br>Ukraine<br>State<br>Ecological<br>Academy for<br>Post-Graduate<br>Education and<br>Management |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

## 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Being one of the 4 (four) Implementing Agencies (IA) designated by the Multilateral Fund (MLF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supports selected countries to implement the Montreal Protocol's ozone depleting substances (ODS) phase-out projects. In Ukraine, the UNDP, under the support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is implementing the Project "Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region" to support the fulfilment of obligations incurred by Ukraine under the present phase-out schedule for HCFCs providing for the decrease in HCFC consumption to at least 99.5% below baseline levels in 2020, culminating in a completed HCFC phase-out in 2030.

A principal component of the Project is the investment programme that aims at a rapid HCFC phase-out in the manufacturing sector and include activities related to technological conversion of polyurethane foam sector in Ukraine in order to eliminate the use of the blowing agent HCFC-141b – a significant ozone depleting as well as a global warming substance – by replacing it with non-ozone depleting, low global warming potential (GWP) alternatives.

The national project component for Ukraine was designed to assist the country to return into compliance through achieving the following goals:

- A finalized and adopted HCFC accelerated phase-out strategy;
- Implementation of national level training for Environmental and Customs enforcement authorities; and
- Targeted HCFC phase out investment projects in eligible enterprises in the manufacturing sector and information exchange on emerging HCFC substitute technologies for ineligible companies

The national project in Ukraine has been implemented under UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2012-2016 in a Direct Execution Modality in close partnership with the major project counterparts, particularly the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine in present).

The originally planned project closing date was 30 July 2016. But based on specific delays in Ukraine and uneven progress with the national components in other countries, a request for 2-year project extension until 31 July 2018 was discussed and approved at the regional Project Board meeting in June 2015.

The original Project Document had 2 key components to assist the country to return to compliance and achieve HCFC phase-out goals. During the substantive project revision, conducted during 2016-2017 and approved in April 2018, only those outputs pertaining to the project Component 2 were revised as described here below.

**Component 1:** *Regional accelerated phase-out capacity building.* This component was successfully implemented and completed by 31 July 2018. Key outcomes of this component were achieved and evaluated, and no change or activities were planned in the project extension phase.

**Component 2:** *National Level Capacity Strengthening and HCFC Phase Out Investment.* This component was revised in 2018 and activities during the project extension phase include:

**Output 2.1.** Support for adoption of comprehensive strategy for the Montreal Protocol implementation (including awareness building program for key stakeholders such as the government authorities, public, and civil society on issues related to the Montreal Protocol implementation and HCFC reduction obligations; ODS and ODS alternative survey to determine their consumption in Ukraine);

**Output 2.2.** Additional activities to ensure use of Analytical Tools for HCFC control enforcement agencies under sub-component Implementation of national level training for Environmental and Customs enforcement authorities.

**Output 2.3.** Completion of the investment component by including eligible enterprises in the manufacturing sector and supporting technology conversion to non-ODS low-GWP technology options.

**Output 2.4.** Demonstration of zero-ODS and low-GWP technology options in the servicing sector (new sub-component)

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines<sup>16</sup> and UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects<sup>17</sup>.

The objective of the evaluation is to supplement the regional TE Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT region with National component Ukraine through assessing the achievement of the national project results, and design of lessons that can both

<sup>16</sup> [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP\\_Evaluation\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

improve the sustainability of the achieved results of the project, and assist in the overall development of UNDP's programmatic approach to improve compliance with Montreal protocol.

#### **4. Evaluation approach and method**

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact** (see Annex C), as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Due to the COVID-19 situation, the evaluator is not expected to conduct any field missions to Ukraine. Online interviews will be held with the following organizations:

- 1) Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine
- 2) State Fiscal Service of Ukraine/State Customs Service of Ukraine
- 3) State Ecological Academy for Post-Graduate Education and Management Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, GEF Focal Point
- 4) Recipients of UNDP support:
  - PE "Khimpostachalnyk"
  - "PCF Advance" LLC;
  - Polyfoam LLC

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the revised project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports (Ukraine section), project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

#### **5. Detailed Scope of work**

The International consultant will assess the following four categories of national project progress. See the Guidance for Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for additional information.

### *1. Project Strategy*

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the national project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the national Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the national project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the national project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- Review to what extent did the national project contribute to the SDGs and the UNDP Strategic Plan?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the national project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets were (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound).
- Are the national project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within the project's time frame?

### *2. Progress Towards Results*

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

| Project strategy | Indicator <sup>18</sup> | Baseline level <sup>19</sup> | Level 1 <sup>st</sup> (self-reported) | Midterm PIR m target <sup>20</sup> | End of project assessment target <sup>21</sup> | Achievement rating <sup>22</sup> | Justification for rating |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|

Objective Indicator  
: (if applicable)  
:

Outcome Indicator 1:  
2: Indicator 2:  
Etc.

#### Indicator Assessment Key

|                  |                                   |                                    |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Green = Achieved | Yellow = On target to be achieved | Red = Not on target to be achieved |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyze the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Final Evaluation.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits;  
By reviewing the aspects of the project that were not successful, identify lessons learned for future interventions;
- Make sure the data used is gender-disaggregated, whereas the progress analysis is gender-sensitive.

### 3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

#### Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the national Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and

<sup>18</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>19</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>20</sup> If available

<sup>21</sup> Color code this column only

<sup>22</sup> Use the 6-point Progress Towards Result Rating: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU



- reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

### Overall Effectiveness

- Is the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine (Customs) equipped with specialized and portable equipment for OSD substances identification?
- Are the downstream users technologically converted to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (water/HCOs/HFOs)?
- Did the commercial enterprises converted its technologies towards the non-ODS/ low GWP (to water/HCOs/HFO based)?
- Are the companies introduced the incoming/outgoing quality control in production cycle?
- Are the safety measures introduced by companies?
- Are the separate storage of flammable substances constructed and functioning?
- Do the capacity of laboratory staff enhanced?
- Was the market survey on the historical and predicted use of existing and new ODS alternatives, including low and high GWP alternatives and their distribution by sector and subsector carried out?
- Was the action plan adequate to deliver the envisaged result? Were the revisions to action plan well justified?
- Were the actions taken to achieve the Project goals cost effective?

### EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the National Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in TOR Annex D.

### PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

| Co-financing<br>(type/source) | UNDP own<br>financing (mill.<br>US\$) |        | Government<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Partner Agency<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Total<br>(mill. US\$) |        |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
|                               | Planned                               | Actual | Planned                    | Actual | Planned                        | Actual | Actual                | Actual |
| Grants                        |                                       |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| Loans/Concessions             |                                       |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| • In-kind support             |                                       |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| • Other                       |                                       |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| Totals                        |                                       |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |

#### Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools that were being used including PIR reporting and quarterly financial reporting: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Were they efficient? Were they cost-effective?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Were sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation?

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the national project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of national project objectives?

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board including assessing how well the project has worked with UNDP Ukraine and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures
- Assess how well the Project international consultant and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process has been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### **Communications:**

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

#### **MAINSTREAMING**

UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

#### **IMPACT**

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the national project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include 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.

#### **CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Ukraine. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

### Duty station

Home-based.

### Travel

Not envisaged due to the COVID-19.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 32 days according to the following plan:

| Activity   | Timing  | Completion Date |
|--|---------|-----------------|
| <b>Preparation</b>                                 | 3 days  | 10.08.2020      |
| <b>Evaluation (online interviews, desk review)</b> | 10 days | 30.08.2020      |
| <b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>                     | 15 days | 20.09.2020      |
| <b>Final Report</b>                                | 2 days  | 30.09.2020      |

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable               | Content  | Timing                           | Responsibilities                           |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Inception Report</b>   | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than July 30, 2020      | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO               |
| <b>Draft Final Report</b> | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes       | No later than September 20, 2020 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |

|                      |                |   |                                       |
|----------------------|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Final Report*</b> | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft, but no later than September 30, 2020 | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |
|----------------------|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CANDIDATE

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The selected evaluator should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The International consultant must present the following qualifications:

- A Master's degree in chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental science, or other closely related field;
- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience on Montreal Protocol and Ozone Depleting Substances;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Experience working with the UN and GEF will be considered an asset;
- Experience on Montreal Protocol implementations in the Europe and CIS region of the project will be considered an asset;
- Fluent written and spoken English; knowledge of Russian or Ukrainian is an asset.

Core Competencies:

- Ethics and Values: Demonstrate and safeguard ethics and integrity;
- Organizational Awareness: Demonstrate corporate knowledge and sound judgment;
- Development and Innovation: Take charge of self-development and take initiative;
- Work in teams: Demonstrate ability to work in a multicultural environment and to maintain effective working relations with people of different national and cultural backgrounds;
- Communicating and Information Sharing: Facilitate and encourage open communication and strive for effective communication;

- Conflict Management: Surface conflicts and address them proactively acknowledging different feelings and views and directing energy towards a mutually acceptable solution;
- Continuous Learning and Knowledge Sharing: Encourage learning and sharing of knowledge.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations”](#).

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

| %   | Milestone   |
|-----|---|
| 10% | Following submission of a detailed workplan/inception report  |
| 60% | Upon submission of the draft TE report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice |
| 30% | Upon finalization of the TE report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice     |

## EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis **taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.**

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews and interviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified (received minimum 70% of maximum available technical scores) for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation”).

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Education (**maximum 10 points**): A Master’s degree in chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental science, or other closely related field – 8 points; PhD in relevant field – 10 points;
- Relevant professional experience on Montreal Protocol and Ozone Depleting Substances (**maximum 20 points**): at least 5 years – 15 points; 11 or more years – 20 points;

- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (**maximum 20 points**): 5 years of experience – 10 points; 6 or more years – 20 points;
- Experience working with the UN and GEF (**maximum 10 points**): no – 0 points; yes – 10 points;
- Experience on Montreal Protocol implementations in the Europe and CIS region of the project (**maximum 5 points**): no – 0 points; yes – 5 points;
- Fluent written and spoken English; knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian (**maximum 5 points**): no knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian – 0 points; knowledge of Ukrainian or Russian – 5 points.

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – maximum 30 points will be assigned to the financial proposal with the lowest price. All other proposals will be evaluated and assigned points, as per below formula:

$$30 \text{ points} [\text{max points available for financial proposal}] \times [\text{lowest of all evaluated offered prices among responsive offers}] / [\text{evaluated price}].$$

The proposal obtaining the overall cumulatively highest score after adding the score of the technical proposal and the financial proposal will be considered as the most compliant offer and will be awarded a contract.

## APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Qualified candidates will be selected from the evaluation roster within the [GPN/ExpRes consolidated roster platform](#) :

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a **brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (if applicable). Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Filled P11 form** / CV including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees  
(blank form can be downloaded from [http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11\\_modified\\_for\\_SCs\\_and\\_ICs.doc](http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc) )
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and supported by a breakdown of costs, as per Annex I template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template (can be downloaded from [http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view\\_file.cfm?doc\\_id=13028](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=13028)). Please note that all travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.) will be reimbursed separately as per UNDP rules.
- **Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials**

**Payments** will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Prepared by:

Yuliya Petsyk,  
Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_ Date:

Approved by:

Manal Fouani,  
Deputy Resident Representative

\_\_\_\_\_ Date:

.



## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</b></p> <p>Government adopts policy frameworks and mechanisms to ensure reversal of environmental degradation; climate change mitigation and adaptation; and prevention of and response to natural and human-caused disasters.</p>  |
| <p><b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b></p> <p>Percent of national and subnational government bodies that integrate environment, DRR and climate change in development and management plans.</p>   |
| <p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b></p> <p>Government adopts policy frameworks and mechanisms to ensure reversal of environmental degradation; climate change mitigation and adaptation; and prevention of and response to natural and human-caused disasters.</p>  |
| <p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b></p> <p><b>Objectives:</b> To protect human health and the environment by assisting countries to phase out consumption and production and prevent releases of ODS according to their commitments to Montreal Protocol phase-out schedules, while enabling low-GHG (Greenhouse Gas) alternative technologies and practices.</p> <p><b>Program:</b></p> <p>For the period of GEF-4, the GEF will assist eligible countries in meeting their HCFC phase-out obligations under the Montreal Protocol, and strengthening capacities and institutions in those countries that still are faced with difficulties in meeting their reporting obligations.</p> |
| <p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) HCFCs are phased-out according to Montreal Protocol schedule, or faster, in GEF-eligible countries</li> <li>(2) GEF-eligible countries meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Indicators for Outcome 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) ODP adjusted tons of HCFCs phased-out from consumption (GEF-4 replenishment target: HCFCs: 50-70 ODP tons)</li> <li>(b) Percentage reduction in HCFC consumption in the participating countries</li> </ul> </li> <li>(2) Indicators for Outcome 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Percentage of GEF-funded countries that meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

| Project Strategy  | Objectively verifiable indicators  | Baseline  | Target   | Sources of verification   | Assumptions  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| <i><u>Objective:</u> To achieve compliance of Ukraine with the accelerated Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out requirements through stabilization and progressive reduction of HCFC consumption.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ukraine returns to compliance with the MP obligations and sustains the status for 2020 milestone</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of approved HCFC phase-out strategy;</li> <li>Continued institutional changes and weak institutional capacity to implement Montreal Protocol;</li> <li>No current information products and programs on Montreal Protocol and HCFC phase-out obligations;</li> <li>Lack of technical tools to test gas composition and quality as well as to limit emissions of HCFCs during equipment maintenance;</li> <li>Limited exposure to alternative technologies in manufacturing sector;</li> <li>Large number of GEF ineligible manufacturing enterprises (MLF cut-off date)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCFC phase-out strategy fully formulated and recommended for adoption and implementation;</li> <li>Effective regulatory instruments to control HCFC use, and thus, import of HCFCs and HCFC containing equipment in place and effectively implemented;</li> <li>Institutional capacity is substantially improved through regional cooperation and implementation of Stage I;</li> <li>Current capacities of project stakeholders strengthened through capacity building, knowledge exchange platforms on new technological developments and investment support for eligible enterprises in manufacturing sector.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status of HCFC phase-out strategy as a formal government strategic document;</li> <li>National legal and regulatory registers</li> <li>Art 7 reporting to Ozone Secretariat on HCFC import and monitoring of HCFC import reduction;</li> <li>Project Progress and M/E reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall government commitment and assumption of appropriate responsibility;</li> <li>Regulatory enforcement resources and capacity available;</li> <li>Project stakeholders actively participate in the project implementation and realization of HCFC phase-out strategy;</li> <li>Accurate monitoring and reporting.</li> </ul> |

| Project Strategy  | Objectively verifiable indicators   | Baseline  | Target   | Sources of verification  | Assumptions  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <i>Outcome 2: National level phase-out capacity building</i>  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <i>Outcome 2 (c – Ukraine): HPMP, National Level Capacity Strengthening and HCFC Phase Out Investment</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trained working level Environmental and Customs enforcement officials using resources (trainers and training materials) from Component 1 with respect to legislation, regulations, and customs controls</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Government stakeholders as well as working level officials have limited awareness of HCFC phase-out issue, challenges to address it and skills/tools to enforce HCFC control measures in practice;</li> <li>Lack of portable HCFC analytical equipment;</li> <li>Limited active educational efforts or tools are available;</li> <li>No current information products and programs</li> <li>Illegal trade in ODS continues unregistered and unnoticed;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of HCFC control issues into curricula of Environmental and Customs' training institutions;</li> <li>Well informed enforcement stakeholder community engaged in addressing HCFC phase-out issue with required level of understanding and technical capacity;</li> <li>State Fiscal Service of Ukraine (Customs) is equipped with basic portable analytical instrumentation;</li> <li>HCFC and HCFC equipment import quota system(s) are enforced to return the country into compliance;</li> <li>HCFC imports are appropriately registered and reported to NOU;</li> <li>Illegal trade is registered and stopped at entry points.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepared and registered educational curricula</li> <li>Attendance at training information sessions and events</li> <li>Customs reporting information</li> <li>Procurement documents on supply of equipment</li> <li>Project Progress and M/E reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interagency coordination (Ministry of Education is supportive of changes to curricula) is sustainable through high-level Government support</li> <li>Sustaining interest and capacity in educational institutions to maintain educational programs</li> <li>Active participation and partnership with education institutions and large scale attendance of training events</li> </ul> |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted HCFC Phase-out Investment Program and Demonstration projects</li> </ul>   |   |  |  |  |

| <i>Project Strategy</i> | <i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>  | <i>Baseline</i>  | <i>Target</i>   | <i>Sources of verification</i>   | <i>Assumptions</i>  |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of blending operation conversion to non-ODS/very low GWP alternative (water/HCOs/HFOs) at PE Khimpostachalnyk ("Khimpostachalnyk")</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PE Khimpostachalnyk (system house) and its downstream users continue to depend on HCFC-141b in polyol blending and consumption;</li> <li>• Alternative technologies are scarcely available to the company, and its downstream clients, for access and transfer, not tested at the facility and lack processing and safety instrumentation for practical introduction;</li> <li>• No current information products and programs on information dissemination related to the proposed alternative technologies in the manufacturing sector.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PE Khimpostachalnyk and its downstream users are technologically converted to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (water/HCOs/HFOs)</li> <li>• HCFC use at PE Khimpostachalnyk stopped and company committed not to use HCFCs any longer</li> <li>• Technical staff is knowledgeable on correct use of new technology</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement documents on supply of equipment</li> <li>• Mission and site visits reports of international and national consultants</li> <li>• Company's written commitments to stop usage of HCFCs in manufacturing processes</li> <li>• Project Progress and M/E reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP requires regular reporting and conducts monitoring of equipment use</li> <li>• Supplied equipment is adequately maintained and used by company</li> <li>• Company continues to co-finance the project as specified in the co-finance commitments</li> </ul> |

| <i>Project Strategy</i> | <i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>   | <i>Baseline</i>  | <i>Target</i>  | <i>Sources of verification</i>   | <i>Assumptions</i>  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of a PU foam conversion to water/HCOs/HFOs (non-ODS/very low GWP blowing agent) at VKF Edvans LLC ("Advance")</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advance (spray foam manufacturing) depends on HCFC-141b in its manufacturing processes;</li> <li>Alternative technologies are scarcely available to the company for access and transfer, not tested at the facility and lack processing and safety instrumentation for practical introduction;</li> <li>Spray foam manufactured by the company continues to be produced with HCFC-141b in foam insulation.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advance technologically converted to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (water/HCOs/HFOs)</li> <li>HCFC use at Advance stopped and company committed not to use HCFCs any longer</li> <li>Technical staff is knowledgeable on correct use of new technology</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procurement documents on supply of equipment</li> <li>Mission and site visits reports of international and national consultants</li> <li>Company's written commitments to stop usage of HCFCs in manufacturing processes</li> <li>Project Progress and M/E reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP requires regular reporting and conducts monitoring of equipment use</li> <li>Supplied equipment is adequately maintained and used by company</li> <li>Company continues to co-finance the project as specified in the co-finance commitments</li> </ul> |

| <i>Project Strategy</i> | <i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>   | <i>Baseline</i>  | <i>Target</i>   | <i>Sources of verification</i>   | <i>Assumptions</i>   |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Demonstration project in servicing sector</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• large use of HCFC-22 in servicing sector especially in domestic airconditioners and commercial refrigerators ;</li> <li>• Alternative technologies are scarcely available to the company for access and transfer, not tested at the facility and lack processing and safety instrumentation for practical introduction</li> <li>• Refrigeration equipment continues to use HCFC-22</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial enterprises retrofits a few of its equipment to non-ODS/ low GWP technology (to hydrocarbons based);</li> <li>• HCFC use at such enterprises reduced and company decides to further convert all HCFC based equipment to non-ODS/ low GWP technology;</li> <li>• Technical staff is knowledgeable on correct use of new technology.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement documents on supply of equipment;</li> <li>• Mission and site visits reports of international and national consultants;</li> <li>• Company's written commitments to stop usage of HCFCs in manufacturing processes;</li> <li>• Project Progress and M/E reports.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP requires regular reporting and conducts monitoring of equipment use;</li> <li>• Supplied equipment is adequately maintained and used by company;</li> <li>• Company continues to co-finance the project as specified in the co-finance commitments.</li> </ul> |

| <i>Project Strategy</i> | <i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>  | <i>Baseline</i>   | <i>Target</i>  | <i>Sources of verification</i>   | <i>Assumptions</i>  |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Awareness building program for Government authorities and other key stakeholders on issues related to the Montreal Protocol and HCFC reduction obligations</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low awareness about the Montreal Protocol and HCFC phase-out schedule in Government sector, and public in general</li> <li>• Inter-agency coordination to address HCFC phase-out is limited;</li> <li>• Low level of awareness related to technologies for HCFC phase-out and linkages with energy efficiency;</li> <li>• Due to lack of awareness inter agency coordination is poor and project implementation might lack wider support.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inter-agency coordination related to HCFC phase-out is improved</li> <li>• Main stakeholders are informed about HCFC phase-out strategy and regulatory measures related to HCFC import and use control</li> <li>• Widely accessible information on HCFC phase-out strategy and its elements;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verification of training records;</li> <li>• Monitoring of press and media coverage;</li> <li>• Project Progress and M/E reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government commitment to timely processing of required HCFC action plan and regulations</li> <li>• Art 7 compliance reporting to Ozone Secretariat</li> <li>• Interagency coordination is sustainable through high-level Government support</li> </ul> |

| <i>Project Strategy</i> | <i>Objectively verifiable indicators</i>                                 | <i>Baseline</i>   | <i>Target</i>   | <i>Sources of verification</i>                                    | <i>Assumptions</i>  |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
|                         | Output 2c.6 (new activity) – HCFC and HCFC alternative survey in Ukraine | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data discrepancy about HCFC consumption as reported in the country program report and consumption stated by industry players</li> <li>• Lack of awareness about HFC and other HCFC alternatives availability and usage in Ukraine</li> <li>• Possibility of illegal import resulting in higher amount of HCFC availability in the country</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The key objective of this study will be to develop a national inventory of HCFCs/HFCs/other ODS alternatives that are imported, used and banked in Ukraine, to estimate current and projected levels of HCFC/HFC use and emissions and to survey and report on the historical and predicted use of existing and new ODS alternatives, including low and high GWP alternatives and their distribution by sector and subsector.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey report</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internationally approved methodology is adopted for this survey</li> <li>• National consultant has access to all required sources of data for detailed survey</li> </ul> |



## 7.6 Annex VI: Selected Project Communication November 2019 – August 2020

### Evaluation of the Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region” Project Project Correspondence UNDP-U Co and Government – Summary/Chronology

| Time                | Developments (Event/Meeting/Document)  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>20 Nov. 2019</b> | <p><b>Project Board Meeting</b></p> <p>The Project Board meeting was convened to assess the progress of the Project implementation in 2019 and discuss the project phase-out plan and follow up approach.</p> <p><b>Ms Iryna Stavchuk (Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry had requested the board meeting to discuss the project progress, delays and reasons behind that and find a way forward, especially given the time constraints for project completion.</li> <li>The Deputy Minister reiterated that the Ministry would like to voice its concern about the mismanagement of some of the project activities.</li> <li>Some activities of the Project were implemented without consultation with the Ministry.</li> <li>She would be responsible for [coordination] of [Ozone] project implementation on behalf of the Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine.</li> <li>Expressed concern that activities under “Ozone Action” awareness campaign (social media posts to knowledge fair, and ozone centre opening), were not agreed with the Ministry and asked about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) the amount of funds, allocated for the awareness component;</li> <li>(2) why the focus of communication was changed from policy makers and companies to children and</li> <li>(3) why the Ministry was not informed/invited to the official opening of the centre in September and other events.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Comment about project components 2 and 3, in particular about the trainings, expressed concern that the personnel who were trained to work with the equipment may not have retained the knowledge to be able to use the equipment without being re-trained.</li> <li>Concerned that the staff was trained without actual equipment.</li> <li>Expressed concern that the activities planned under project output 2.3 (work with the enterprise) would not be completed until the end of the Project, as it took a long time to sign the contract with them (one year with PE “Khimpostachalnyk” and one and a half year with “VKF Edvans”)</li> <li>Emphasized that it would be good to invite the representatives of the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine for the next meeting</li> </ul> <p><b>Mr Kostyantyn Chyzhyk (Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine):</b></p> |

| Time      | Developments (Event/Meeting/Document)   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentioned request from the Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine to all the international organizations and donors to provide some information about the projects and it has not been received.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mr Alla Tynkevych (UNDP):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Presented project results:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project faced serious challenges because of the conflict which started in 2014, therefore, hindering the work with those selected enterprises that were located in the NGCA (Non-Governmental Controlled Area);</li> <li>Project required subsequent serious revision which led to identification of additional enterprises to replace those located in NGCA. New enterprises (so called system houses) were selected based on a set of defined criteria – Khimpostachalnyk and VKF Edvans (respective contracts signed in March and October 2019);</li> <li>Project has provided additional assistance at the request of the Ministry with hosting of Europe and Central Asia (ECA) Enforcement and Network Meetings, Kyiv, Ukraine, 24-27 September 2019;</li> <li>Project provided very targeted assistance to the Ministry on the development of the Draft Law on Ozone Depleting Substances and Fluorinated Greenhouse Gases (subsequently passed by the Parliament in the 1st reading);</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Mr Andriy Zayika (UNDP):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP senior management team was informed of the request and the information was provided with an email on 14 November</li> </ul> <p><b>Ms Manal Fouani (UNDP):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentioned that UNDP has a fully transparent recruitment and procurement process and is ready to share these processes with the Ministry</li> <li>Proposed to collect all the questions from the Ministry's side to UNDP during this board meeting and UNDP would then provide answers (<u>The proposal was supported by the Board Members</u>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Ms Yulia Shadevska (State Fiscal Service):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customs office received equipment (including, chromatography–mass spectrometers and portable gas analyzers) and that the devices were handed over to the customs posts and training center.</li> <li>The equipment was installed, the samples were not provided.</li> </ul> |
| Dec. 2019 | <p><b>UNDP Technical Comments on Ministry Concerns (Seems to be the response to the project board meeting on 20 Nov. 2020)</b></p> <p><b>Lack of communication with the Ministry on the awareness component</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After Parliamentary elections and as a result of the subsequent change of Government, Minister of Ecology and Natural resources of Ukraine and all the Deputy Ministers were dismissed. The Director of the Department for Climate Change and Ozone Layer Protection left her position</li> <li>It unknown to us why the ex-Deputy Minister did not ensure transition on the recent project activities and decisions to his successor</li> </ul> <p><b>Ozone Center Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important to note, that the State Environmental Academy is officially a Project Recipient and included into state registration card in line with the Government's resolution 153 on international technical assistance. This was also confirmed in the MENR letter to the Ministry of Economy requesting to initiate state registration of the Project.</li> <li>In 2016, UNDP and State Environmental Academy concluded an MoU on cooperation.</li> </ul>   |

| Time         | Developments (Event/Meeting/Document)   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ukrainian component of the Project was evaluated within the Terminal Evaluation of the regional Project in May-June 2018.</li> <li>The evaluation pointed out the <u>lack of cooperation of the Project and the project recipient</u>, namely State Environmental Academy. To address this, the project team revitalized cooperation with the State Environmental Academy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Awareness campaign launched via grants mechanism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within the framework of the Awareness Campaign 32 actions, 12 trainings were conducted, 1920 participants were involved, of which 1490 were youth representatives, 290 educators. Prior to the World Ozone Day celebration, 7 regions, more than 420 participants, more than 25 news items were distributed on 9 sites, 45 posts on social networks, and 18 new partnerships were created.</li> <li>In 2018, without a grant mechanism, the awareness campaign with the participation of the Ministry of Environment of Ukraine was associated with only one action in the International Ozone Layer, which was attended by 40 students from the city of Kyiv at the National Ecological and Natural Sciences Center of the Ministry of Education.</li> <li>The total budget of the 3 grant-projects is 174 900 USD</li> </ul> <p><b>Requested to conduct additional training for Customs Officers on portable gas analyzers usage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is planned for 2020 and will be completed by the end of the Project. It is planned to start these activities in Q1 2020 and to completed prior to project closure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Small pilots with servicing sector</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is planned for 2020 and will be completed by the end of the Project. The Grant Agreement stipulates that Recipient Institution shall have exclusive control over administration and implementation of the activities.</li> </ul> |
| Dec. 2019    | <p><b>Minutes of the meeting of Deputy Minister of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine (Not mention of person who made comments)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The resolution of the issue on samples for equipment (machines that do not have samples) was not provided. The Ministry is ready to grant a quota as requested at the previous board meeting, however, this activity must be organized and implemented by the Project, as per allocated budget.</li> <li>The information on training for customs officers is lacking. There is a need to institutionalize trainings and provide methodology or a course structure to the State Academy of Customs.</li> <li>Conflicting information in reports on the project activities and outcomes. The number of training participants varies between reports. There are concerns about the quality of the awareness raising campaign (no mainstream media involved in the awareness-raising campaign). The implemented activities target students, rather than decision-makers, as has been originally agreed.</li> <li>The claim that the lack of awareness on the part of the Ministry about the Project is due to poor communication with the former Ministry team is irrelevant. The staff that has been working on the Project remains employed by the Ministry.</li> <li>The rationale for inviting participants to the awareness raising trip to Armenia (June 2019) needs to be reviewed and discussed.</li> <li>The practice of asking for project activities on the basis of support letters from NGOs should not be continued.</li> <li>UNDP confirmed their readiness to receive all concerns and complaints from the Ministry in writing for proper follow up. It is critical to agree on the way forward in the project planning and implementing, noting that it falls under the UNDP's direct implementation modality, but it is important to agree with the government counterpart on the priorities.</li> </ul>                     |
| 19 Dec. 2019 | Letter from Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine to UNDP  |

| Time         | Developments (Event/Meeting/Document)   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <p><b>Ms. Iryna Stavchuk (Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request the purchase of clean ozone-depleting control samples for testing and calibration, as it is not possible to do the control of ozone-depleting substances without them, mention that the Ministry is ready to provide the necessary quota for import to prepare control samples for Ukraine.</li> <li>Concern regarding the delay in the implementation of the component aimed at demonstration of zero ODS and low GWP technology options for HCFC phase-out in the servicing sector.</li> <li>Concern of the implementation of the technical investment activities at PE Khimpostachalnyk and VKF Edvans companies.</li> <li>Reported information by the project team is <u>doubtful regarding output 2c.5</u> (awareness campaign) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness-raising campaigns targeted school children and not employees of the state authorities, which are could actually provide support to phase-out of HCFC</li> <li>Concerns on the feasibility and the justification of the establishment of the Ozon Centre, which was not foreseen and not agreed with the Government. It is a room for 12 people. Study tour to Armenia had no representative from the Government, but it had from NGOs and the Ukrainian Orthodox church</li> <li>Concerns as a different report provides information where the No of participants and media outreach from media campaign differ by 10 times, the Ministry doubt the results delivered to reflect the funds provided to the activity</li> </ul> </li> <li>Concerns with the communication of the Project as they are not discussed or agreed with the Ministry as beneficiary. The project team mentions that it is due to changes in the Government which cannot be as the personnel assigned to the Project are still working in the Ministry.</li> <li>Propose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of an updated work plan</li> <li>Organization of a meeting to agree on the work plan</li> <li>Internal UNDP process of project evaluation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| 13 Jan. 2020 | <p><b>Letter from UNDP to Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine</b></p> <p><b>Ms Dafina Gercheva (UNDP)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees on the importance to procure ozone-depleting control samples and thank the ministry quote, UNDP will initiate the procurement according to the rules and regulations, request to discuss the formal mechanism for allocating the quota.</li> <li>UNDP recognized the importance of capacity building in the State Customs Service, and it is ready to provide the necessary trainings as well to integrate the courses in the curricula of the State Customs Service's educational institutions.</li> <li>UNDP recognizes the delay in pilot projects and zero ODS and low GWP technology options, UNDP is ready to implement the pilots within the project lifespan</li> <li>UNDP mentions that activities in PE Khimpostachalnyk and Advance companies are currently on track.</li> <li>Regarding the awareness campaign: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness activities focused on children were supported by the previous Government during 2017 and 2018, UNDP takes note of the strategic vision of the current Ministry and will align the awareness-raising component to it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

| Time         | Developments (Event/Meeting/Document)   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Information discrepancy on numbers is reflected on the period when the information was provided, as UNDP report was until July 2019 while the ministry report referred to the 2019 Ozone day activity. Consolidated information on all awareness activities was presented in the board meeting</li> <li>• UNDP will continue to ensure effective governance mechanism for the project implementation and improve direct communication with the Ministry, including conducting frequent board meetings.</li> <li>• According to the proposal of the Ministry:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ UNDP agrees to develop an updated work plan for 2020 in consultation with the Ministry, which will be approved by the project board on January 2020</li> <li>○ UNDP agrees to launch a project evaluation to capture the lesson learned.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| 17 Aug. 2020 | <p><b>Letter from Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine to UNDP</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Iryna Stavchuk (Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection of Ukraine):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The letter makes a recount of all the meetings with UNDP starting with the constant request for a first meeting that finally took place on 4 of October 2009, after 3 letters requesting a management and project board meeting.</li> <li>• Another meeting was held on 20 of November 2020 where problems in project implementation were further discussed</li> <li>• The project work plan for 2020 was approved in a meeting held the 4 of February 2020</li> <li>• 5 meetings and email correspondence during 24/02/2020-21/04/2020 in which projects experts confirmed that pilot projects were going to be implemented in due time taking into account quarantine measures.</li> <li>• Ministry expresses concern regarding the equipment provided to the State Customs control in which 2 chromatographs do not work, and there is need of training for a specialist so they can work with portable gas analyzers; the Ministry considers that this situation makes impossible to achieve the Project's goal and questions the effectiveness of the funds used under this component</li> <li>• The Ministry mentions the need to complete implementation of components related to equipment transfer, purchase of sample, trainings, and pilot projects</li> <li>• The Ministry considers that the agreement on the implementation of activities reached in December 2019, remains unfinished to the date</li> <li>• The Ministry requested to be interviewed in case of evaluation of the Project</li> </ul> |

