

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Inadequate
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00074537
Portfolio/Project Title:	Bioenergy Technologies
Portfolio/Project Date:	2014-06-24 / 2020-02-28

Strategic

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☐ 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- ☒ 1: *The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.*

Evidence:

The project has established a Financial Support Mechanism, which made an easy access to the loan financing but didn't affect the interest rates. Therefore, the project strategy has been revised in the following way: (i) The marketing campaign has been intensified to initiate municipal bioenergy projects (MBPs); (ii) TA provided to municipalities in MBP development includes not only feasibility studies but also technical design and investment support; (iii) project was extended by 18 months to complete all planned activities.

The uploaded documents provide evidence on the above. In particular, it is stated in the Request for extension that "The implementation strategy for Component 3 also has been changed. It has been decided not to have any more trainings apart from 50 already conducted and to terminate the contract for Development of Biomass training/information toolkit and delivery of trainings. This will lead to considerable cost savings of around USD 400 K and these funds can be re-allocated to support the successful implementation of the FSM".

It is stated in the second document, PIR-2018, that the implementation strategy has been adjusted. In line with the adjusted strategy: (i) feasibility of MBPs was carefully studied for different types of agricultural biomass and the most feasible options identified; (ii) Project Support Platform (PSP) was established to make the pilot MBPs financially feasible through providing: (a) Technical Assistance (TA) in development of feasibility studies, loan applications, technical designs, etc.; (b) performance-based grants. At the same time, there is no evidence that the financial mechanism was replicated and scaled up to other similar activities after the project was closed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2921UKRBiomassNo-costExtensionRequest7May2018-JO_Finalized_2279_301_5678_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2921UKRBiomassNo-costExtensionRequest7May2018-JO_Finalized_2279_301_5678_301.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	7/29/2020 10:28:00 AM
2	2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS2921-GEFID43775_2279_301_5678_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS2921-GEFID43775_2279_301_5678_301.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	7/29/2020 10:28:00 AM
3	ProjectBoardMinutes_EEPBBiomass_2018_12_20_signed_5678_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardMinutes_EEPBBiomass_2018_12_20_signed_5678_301.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:33:00 PM
4	Evidence4_LetterfromNationalBank_onunsecuredloans_5678_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evidence4_LetterfromNationalBank_onunsecuredloans_5678_301.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:33:00 PM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☐ 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responded to the Sustainable development pathways, namely Sustainable access to energy and improved energy efficiency focus area by offering strong connections to issues of environmental sustainability through creating better conditions to find and scale-up inclusive market-based solutions to achieving affordable and clean energy access, especially to off-grid sources of renewable energy). This has been done through improvement of legal and regulatory frameworks, and also strengthening of capacities of public and private sectors to broadly develop municipal bioenergy systems in a sustainable way. This, in turn, allowed scaling-up of market-based solutions to achieving affordable and clean heat energy supply by using energy of agricultural biomass. RRF among others included indicators: Streamlined and comprehensive market-oriented policy and legal/regulatory framework finalized; Financial Support Mechanism (FSM) established and operationalized; Completed pilot projects on municipal biomass heating and hot water systems.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Project beneficiaries include target municipalities, regional governments and some executive bodies of the central government. In 2018-2019 the project closely cooperated with all targeted groups in development of more than 30 pilot projects. At the government level: close cooperation was established with the State Agency on Energy Efficiency and Energy Efficiency (SAEE) to initiate the pilot projects as well as communication with the partner municipalities; At the municipal level: more than 30 MoUs were signed with municipalities, absed of which, assistance was provided in developing of Feasibility Studies (for 33 projects), Technical Designs (19 projects), investment support (12 projects). FS reports were accepted by the beneficiaries; ToRs for technical design were prepared by the beneficiaries while the designs prepared by the Project and examined by the independent parties. The Project assisted beneficiaries in establishing continuous monitoring and evaluation of the implemented pilots.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ПРООНЛященко_5678_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ПРООНЛященко_5678_303.tif)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:34:00 PM
2	ПРООНЯнтотмасХімстра_5678_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ПРООНЯнтотмасХімстра_5678_303.tif)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:35:00 PM
3	2018-02-07_15-01-03-627-fileMENRletter_5678_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018-02-07_15-01-03-627-fileMENRletter_5678_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:34:00 PM
4	Letterofappreciation_requestforPKD_Naddnriprianske_5678_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Letterofappreciation_requestforPKD_Naddnriprianske_5678_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:34:00 PM

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☐ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

Evidence:

Lessons learned gained from the monitoring and evaluation of the implemented activities as well as those ones captured in the Midterm Review along with MTR findings, conclusions and recommendations have been considered by the project and CO team, discussed in project board meeting, and as a result the implementation strategy has been revised. The revised implementation strategy allowed increase the likelihood of achievement of established targets. The lessons learned will be included in the final report of the Project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2012_AWP_BIOMASS_Atlas_5678_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2012_AWP_BIOMASS_Atlas_5678_304.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:36:00 PM
2	Biomass_PIP_2018_Updated_5678_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Biomass_PIP_2018_Updated_5678_304.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:36:00 PM
3	Biomass_PIP_2019_Updated_5678_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Biomass_PIP_2019_Updated_5678_304.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:36:00 PM
4	AWP2019_Bioenergyproject_5678_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP2019_Bioenergyproject_5678_304.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:36:00 PM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☐ 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- ☐ 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- ☒ 1: *The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.*

Evidence:

The project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries to meaningfully contribute to development change. This is evidenced by the fact that according to the project document, 18 pilot projects have to be implemented. Actually project has implemented much more pilots, and not only of one type (use of biomass in municipal heat and hot water supply systems) but of four types (additional types: plantation of energy crops, production of biofuel, combined heat and power production by using biofuel). In total the following pilot projects have been implemented:

- 13 pilot projects (10 biomass boiler houses + 3 energy willow nurseries) completed
- 3 pilot projects will be completed in early 2020
- 15 pilot projects will be completed before the start of 2020-2021 heating season
- 11 pilot projects will be completed in 2020-2021
- 1 large pilot project (CHP with 6.6 MW electric and 25 MW thermal capacity) will be completed in 2 years.

The above numbers evidences that the project has reached sufficient number of beneficiaries. Unfortunately, not all the projects (pilots) have been completed within the project time frame.

At the same time, elaborated financial mechanism was not able to be applicable without extension of the project and no co-financing was attracted to ensure sufficient scalability of the project activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectsassistedbyUNDP-November2019_2279_305_5678_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectsassistedbyUNDP-November2019_2279_305_5678_305 .xlsx)	alla.tynkevyich@undp.org	7/29/2020 10:30:00 AM

Principled**Quality Rating:** Needs Improvement

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☐ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☒ 1: *The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.*

Evidence:

The project has no direct measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to the project results and activities. However, the project team has some data and evidence on the measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. The Project focuses to ensure that, women represent at least 50% of beneficiaries. Many pilot projects are of educational and medical facilities where women teachers and doctors constitute the majority (about 80% of Ukrainian secondary and high school teachers are women) are actively involved in shaping sustainable future through participating in practical initiatives providing for quick, affordable and healthy school renovations (for example, biomass burning boilers installation and switching from burning fossil fuels to bioenergy). Women were active participated in Awareness and Capacity Building Training Campaign.

Management Response:

Gender need assessment was not prepared.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The project promotes the energy generation from biomass, which is the renewable energy source, and thus contributes to climate change mitigation through the reduction of CO2 emissions. Actual GHG reductions due to the implementation of pilot projects were continuously monitored, and future reductions estimated in a conservative way. Under the feasibility studies environmental and social impacts were carefully studied. As the most of pilot projects are of small-scale activities, they are not associated with high environmental and social risks, especially considering that the biomass used for energy generation represents either agricultural wastes or energy crops (biomass harvested from energy plantations on non-productive lands) but not wood, and thus, doesn't lead to logging and de-forestation. Nevertheless, potential risks (e.g. related to resource supply and land-use issues) were continuously monitored. The implementation of pilot projects also contributed to the creation of green jobs and caused positive impact on social development. At the time of the project start there was no requirement to have SESP document as a part of the project documentation package.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- ☒ 1: *Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)*

Evidence:

No such mechanism is currently available.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☐ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

Evidence: Project was annually updating M&E plan. Implementation of M&E plan was being discussed during the development of Annual Work Plans and at the Mid-Year Reviews of AWP. Progress in achievement of targets under the established indicators were reported regularly in UNDP-GEF Project Implementation Reviews. Based on results of M&E project implementation strategy has been revised, types of supported projects diversified, assistance to beneficiaries intensified.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2017-GEF-PIR-PIMS2921-GEFID4377_5678_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017-GEF-PIR-PIMS2921-GEFID4377_5678_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:37:00 PM
2	2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS2921-GEFID43773_5678_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS2921-GEFID43773_5678_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:37:00 PM
3	2019_PIR_Biomass_5678_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2019_PIR_Biomass_5678_309.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:37:00 PM
4	PIR-2015-GEFID-PIMS29212_5678_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIR-2015-GEFID-PIMS29212_5678_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:38:00 PM
5	PIR-2016-GEFID-PIMS29212_5678_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIR-2016-GEFID-PIMS29212_5678_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:38:00 PM

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 1: *The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.*

Evidence:

Evidence: The project board duly meets once a year (the PB meeting in 2018 was held on 20 December; the last meeting is scheduled for December 2019). Annual reports on results, risks and opportunities were presented at the Board meetings. The board was reviewing the results and approving project implementation plan and any proposed changes to the project strategy.

Management Response:

The Final Project Board was not held.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PBminutes2018EEPBBiomass_2279_3101_5678_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBminutes2018EEPBBiomass_2279_3101_5678_310.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	7/30/2020 12:20:00 PM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- ☒ 1: *The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.*

Evidence:

The project monitored the key institutional, political and financial risk to certain extent, but were not fully addressed. Management action were not taken timely to mitigate risks.

Management Response:

The last two quarters of project timeframe, the project have been managed by Energy and Environmental Portfolio directly under guidance of Chief Technical Advisor given the restriction related to hiring of Project Manager for the period of less than 6 months. Terminal Evaluation has revealed some issues related to project efficacy. The recommendations will be followed in the upcoming new project related to biomass and will be improved through the new ICF.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ **No**

Evidence:

According to the project document, municipal bioenergy projects (MBPs) should be financed through the created Financial Support Mechanism (FSM). Established in 2018 FSM offered to the MBP investors easy access to financing at 2-3% below the market rates, which are very high in Ukraine (20% and above). Therefore, despite the financial feasibility of many MBP projects even under these conditions, there was very low demand in FSM. Most of the municipalities were looking for cheap credits and/or grants from donor programmes. Only the city of Uman used this opportunity and signed a loan agreement with the local bank (UkrGasbank, loan amount about USD 1 million). Majority of pilot projects were using mixed financing with significant portion of the state/municipal funds. However, this process was related to the long and sometimes bureaucratic procedures and thus, financing of many pilot projects couldn't be closed timely. As a result, most of the pilot projects weren't completed before the end of the Project (December 31, 2019). However, the project provided intensive assistance to the technically and financially feasible pilot projects, and there is a high probability that most of the projects (30 in total) being under the different stages of the development, would be completed in 2020. Due to the fact that the financial mechanism was not able to be implemented, there was no opportunity to mobilise co-financing for the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 1: *The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.*

Evidence:

The project was updating procurement plan as needed, reflecting the updated project strategy developed. Most of the required services (consultancy, others) and goods (mostly, biomass-fired boilers) were procured as planned with some exceptions: one large contract on awareness raising and marketing training has been terminated because of no necessity in these services at such a scale (338 trainings in total). Another issue was related to the underdeveloped market for municipal bioenergy (in terms of consultants as well as technology suppliers), that led to the longer procurement process than initially planned.

Management Response:

The procurement of the boilers during the last month of project implementation caused a delay in its installation, so the CO2 emissions reduction could be attributed to project results only after the project closure. The project team didn't mitigate this risk timely, so it had an impact on overall project performance.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- ☐ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.*
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence:

The project monitored its own costs and tried to achieve the cost efficiencies. However, during the pre-MTR period and in 2017 as well the cost efficiency of pilot projects (with more than 50% grant ratio), and of awareness raising and marketing campaign (contract amount USD 0.75 million including VAT) was doubtful. Therefore, in the awareness and marketing campaign was cancelled (and contract terminated), only 4 pilot projects in 2018-2019 have got investment support in form of grants, and grant ratio was in a range 10-30% of total costs. The pilot projects have got assistance in developing feasibility studies and technical design at very modest costs (cost of FS was on average USD 5,000; cost of design – on average, below USD 10,000) compared with those ones in the project document (USD 3 million for 18 pilot projects). Nevertheless, the quality of provided TA was satisfactory. This is evidenced by the fact that all FS reports were accepted by the beneficiaries, all technical designs went through the independent third party examination as required by the legislation in Ukraine.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	16_Evaluation_report_541-2019-UNDP-UKR-RFQ_Boilers_Navitas_5678_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/16_Evaluation_report_541-2019-UNDP-UKR-RFQ_Boilers_Navitas_5678_314.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:40:00 PM
2	CAPapproval_Navitas_5678_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CAPapproval_Navitas_5678_314.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:40:00 PM
3	Evaluation_ITB_2014_67_signed_all_Averterch_5678_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluation_ITB_2014_67_signed_all_Averterch_5678_314.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:41:00 PM
4	RACP_0000008114_Bioenergy_AverTech_5678_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RACP_0000008114_Bioenergy_AverTech_5678_314.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:41:00 PM

Effective**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Evidence:

As stated by the Terminal Evaluation Team at the de briefing meeting, when the main findings were presented (draft TE report is not submitted yet), results and impacts of the project are striking because:

- Pipeline of projects was developed over last year with feasibility studies and designs, some with substantial scale. Direct GHG ERs are likely to surpass targets (but implementation/ confirmation will happen mostly in 2020).
- Financing work has resulted in enabling environment (central bank and Ministry of Finance policies) for municipal loans (none were possible before). In particular, this would include loans for mid-sized/ small cities. So far, one loan for biomass boilers was disbursed (city of Uman), 4 municipal projects in total.
- City of Zhytomyr is targeting 95% of district heating on average from biomass and has confirmed support from EBRD and SECO. Some sources indicate strong UNDP/GEF project influence.
- BMU (German Dept. of Environment) when asking Government of Ukraine about areas to support in 7 year project came up with 3 cross-cutting areas and biomass as only specific renewable energy area. Strong likelihood of project impact here, particularly Biomass working group.

Specific outputs achieved:

Component 1 – Policy:

- Contributed to adoption of four policies, among them one critical (on biomass-based energy tariff), which made many biomass projects financially feasible.
- Biomass plans prepared/adopted for 7 Regions (but impact of these plans unclear).

Component 2 – Biomass Support Unit (BSU)

- Deemed impractical – perhaps a project design problem.
- Last 1.5 years, project established a roster of experts, a bit like the technical services side of BSU.
- Cross-ministerial working group set up instead. Had 5 meetings

Component 3 – FSM and pilot projects

- Even though there is a low demand on FSM, deeper understanding shows potential big win (“side effect”) to introduce municipal bank loans (especially for mid-size/ small cities).

Pilot projects (Biomass Installations):

- First project team (before March 2018): 12 installations across 4 cities, all with majority grant.
 - Second project team: 33 feasibility studies, 9 detailed designs for biomass boilers. Also some work on briquette making. Some of these projects are likely to be realized/ to be financed.

Component 4 – Info and Awareness

- Very positive feedback on domestic study tour in 2019
 - Booklets/ guides prepared by the project, received positive feedback from several sources.
 - Workshops/ trainings: moderate impact

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- ☐ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence:

The project implementation plan and updated strategy developed was discussed in with Senior management, within the Energy and Environment Portfolio, then discussed and approved during the Project Board Meetings. The project budget revisions have been initiated as needed (including after the MTR, after the project extension). Lessons learned, including from the other UNDP-GEF projects in Ukraine have been used to design new partnership arrangements with the municipalities for the development of pilot projects

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2012_AWP_BIOMASS_Atlas_5678_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2012_AWP_BIOMASS_Atlas_5678_316.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:43:00 PM
2	AWP2019_Bioenergyproject_5678_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP2019_Bioenergyproject_5678_316.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:43:00 PM
3	Biomass_PIP_2018_Updated_5678_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Biomass_PIP_2018_Updated_5678_316.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:43:00 PM
4	Biomass_PIP_2019_Updated_5678_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Biomass_PIP_2019_Updated_5678_316.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:44:00 PM

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☐ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project was systematically engaging target groups, and first of all municipalities, which were developing municipal bioenergy projects. More than 30 Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) were signed with the municipalities. The capacity needs of the partner municipalities have been identified and adequate assistance was provided. In particular, municipalities and banking sector representatives were invited to the Tripartite meeting (UNDP, Municipalities and banks as parties) to discuss broad aspects of MBP development, starting from the pre-feasibility assessment and ending by project financing. Municipalities and other stakeholders as well, participated in the in-country study tour (visit to bioenergy project sites). Two calls were announced for municipalities - to get TA from the Project. More than 80 applications were received in total from practically all the regions of Ukraine. The project has worked with all applicants who met the eligibility criteria.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2018-02-07_15-01-03-627-fileMENRletter_5678_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018-02-07_15-01-03-627-fileMENRletter_5678_317.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:45:00 PM
2	Letterofappreciation_requestforPKD_Naddniprianske_5678_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Letterofappreciation_requestforPKD_Naddniprianske_5678_317.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:45:00 PM

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☒ *Not Applicable*

Evidence:

This project is being implemented under the Direct Implementation Modality, State Agency on Energy Efficiency and Energy Saving of Ukraine (SAEE) was registered as the project beneficiary and a key partner). SAEE was actively engaged in the project decision making (including selection of the pilot projects – on a “no objection” basis), implementation and monitoring. SAEE assisted through its network, in identification of the potential pilot projects. Furthermore, as many pilot projects will not be completed before the Project end, the SAEE will monitor their implementation after the UNDP project closure. The SAEE has received from the project all the materials for that.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☒ [Not Applicable](#)

Evidence:

Considering that the establishment of the Biomass Support Unit, as it was envisaged in the project document, was impossible due to the restructuring of the Government as well as lack of capacities and adequate resources, the Interagency Biomass Working Group (IBWG) was established. But the capability of IBWG was limited in terms of practical assistance in the development of individual MBPs, a Project Support Platform consisted of the Roster of Experts, also was established.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ☒ 1: *The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.*

Evidence:

The project's sustainability plan has been reviewed regularly, especially in 2018-2019 when the project has reviewed the implementation strategy, widened the scope of pilot projects eligible for TA and was looking for financing options (alternative to FSM). This requested regular assessments of the sustainability indicators including financial indicators and re-designing of the exit strategy. Since many pilot project are still under the development the phase-out arrangements also need revision.

Management Response:

The Project Sustainability Plan was not reviewed given the technical activities suspension along with the OAI investigation. At the same time the joint proposal with GIZ "Supporting Implementation of the Paris Agreement and Protection of Biodiversity in Ukraine (SIPAPB)" was intended to ensure the project result sustainably, while regrettably it was not approved by INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE INITIATIVE (IKI).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2921UKRBiomassNo-costExtensionRequest7May2018-JO_Finalized_5678_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2921UKRBiomassNo-costExtensionRequest7May2018-JO_Finalized_5678_320.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:47:00 PM
2	Mail-paata.janelidzeundp.org_5678_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Mail-paata.janelidzeundp.org_5678_320.html)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:46:00 PM
3	IKICountryCallOutline-successfullyuploaded_5678_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IKICountryCallOutline-successfullyuploaded_5678_320.msg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:49:00 PM
4	IKICountryCall_5678_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IKICountryCall_5678_320.msg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	8/31/2021 7:49:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

While the terminal evaluation rating for Development and Commercialization of Bioenergy Technologies in the Municipal Sector in Ukraine Project was set as Marginally Satisfactory, the project procurement activities are still under investigation of the UNDP OAI Office.

After operational closure, the Project has been included in the Global Review of the projects implemented with the support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). As a follow-up to review CO has revised the ICF and strengthen the CO oversight. To strengthen UNDP steering and learning processes, streamline planning, ensure a results-oriented and sound reporting of UNDP's progress, the Integrated Monitoring, Reporting, and Planning Platform (IMRP) was created and launched as a follow up to Global Review. The IMRP platform was introduced to improve the internal monitoring and control over the ongoing activities on the monthly basis. Additionally, the CO will evaluate efficiency of the action under the project and collect the feedbacks from the stakeholders on the ground.

The Energy and Environment Portfolio has also introduced a set of operational and control arrangements to improve the quality of the GEF-related project. For instance, a technical assistance was provided by the CO - an international Chief Technical Advisor was hired to oversight activities under the GEF-funded projects.