

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	750
Evaluation Manager	Susanne Bech
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project "Buildings High-Level Support and National Capacities to Enhance Climate and Ozone Protection Through Cooling Efficiency, GEF Id 1992
PIMS #	1992
GEF ID	
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 – Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Brian Holuj
Office/Division	Climate Change Division
Branch & Unit	Global Climate Action Unit
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	30/05/2024
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	8
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	23/09/2024
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	00/00/00
Implementation Plan finalized (if different from the date above)	00/00/00

Implementation Plan

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
1	The Cooling Project's indicators were not successfully utilized to guide the project. They overlapped and ended up not being good measures of what the project achieved. Solid assessment of the indicators explaining how values were arrived at was lacking. Further, many were unaware of what the Cooling Project was and were instead mainly focused on its	UNEP projects that are comprised of sub-projects should, in their implementation phase, increase their visibility as unified projects with well-known overall aims and with strong attention given to objective level and outcome level indicators of the overall Project.	Important	Project	UNEP senior management, UNEP project managers	As soon as possible	Accepted		Optimiz+K34+A28:K31+A28:K32+K34+A28:K31+A28:K34+A28:K33+K34+A28:K31+B28:K37+B28:K36+B28:K35+C28:K35+B28:K35

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	sub-projects. Many within and without of UNEP were unaware of what the Cooling Project was and were instead mainly focused on its sub-projects. UNEP projects comprised of sub-projects should not be simply matters of convenience but maintain a "the whole is greater than the sum of parts" strategy. To achieve this, UNEP as an organization must develop a culture where overall projects are an important unit of analysis and engagement. There should be strong overall project indicators differentiated (not overlapping) and suitable for each outcome, with indicators being suitably challenging and meaningful, but achievable in the timeframe of the project.								
2	UNEP staff are informally providing ongoing support to countries, such as the 4 Caribbean nations who have not yet adopted their draft NCAPs. Yet, the incredibly important basis set by the Project has a much higher potential of coming to fruition if there is ongoing technical support and encouragement to shepherd adoption of	Recognizing the time for some countries to achieve adoption of impactful policies and plans, senior UNEP management may consider setting aside contingency allocations or raising funds to permit project teams of various projects to provide ongoing support to countries to	Important	Project	UNEP senior management, U4E and other division management, project management, donors	March-September 2024 and ongoing	Accepted		U4E to identify stable funding opportunities with sufficient time horizon for projects involving bottom-up (from scratch) policy interventions - from setting the enabling environment through to adoption and initial implementation support. Then, structure market transformation efforts in phases with logical break points whereby either the same donor can replenish upon

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	these items through at the country and regional level. Adoption of model regulations and MEPS and NCAPs can be a long process. The nature of external context can be due to severe weather events (such as hurricanes), changes in government, civil strife, pandemics and decline of tourism in tourism dependent countries leading to some expected and many unexpected challenges. This may greatly affect the ability of a small country to implement to the extent that funding may become exhausted. Thus, a 4–5-year project may not be able to follow through to see the extensive potential benefits that the sub-project intends to provide; these potential benefits may not be realized unless there are more resources or contingencies left in a budget for continued technical assistance and follow-up. For these small countries, the installer or supplier are sometimes connected with government due to the small number of energy professionals to supply and install cooling equipment. In this context, a focus on small and medium-size	shepherd through policies, regulations, and action plans developed under the project once sub-project funding and main activities for the country have been exhausted. In small countries where the nature of external context can be severe enough to affect implementation in a country to the extent that funding may become exhausted, such allocations could be used for subsequent phases to continue follow-up and support for the country for model regulations and MEPS adoption for RACs, domestic refrigeration, and commercial refrigeration and NCAP adoption. Follow-up and support towards full adoption may not be achieved in a 4- or 5-year project, necessitating more limited post-project funding and more labour intensive efforts through to adoption. Contingency funds should be set aside from the							achievement of a major milestone and/or other donors can pick up support to subsequent complementary efforts.

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	enterprises may be ineffectual due to the lack of such actors in these countries.	start of a sub-project as a part of an exit strategy for sub-projects or the project overall.							
3	Some country and regional efforts under the Cooling Project have seemed to struggle. While this may be due to the challenging nature of the work and the time needed to see impact and various external factors, the importance of increasing success rates suggests a serious, documented review of factors leading to success and those hindering success be prepared.	Conduct an assessment of past projects to identify the factors for successful, timely results in regions and countries and develop strategies to ensure maximum country and regional level results in the future via an improved design and implementation strategy. The strategy may include criteria for country selection, more extended scoping to determine best partners and best country strategy for the sub-project. For regions, a strong regional partner with buy-in from the countries may be needed, as well as a cohesiveness of the region such that countries in it have a desire to adopt similar standards to each other. In the case of the Cooling Project Phase I, this may be part of the exit strategy for scaling up and/or replication.	Important	UNEP-wide	UNEP	If at organizational level February - June 2024. If at project level, March – May, 2024	Accepted		Engage in further evaluations of U4E activities, then utilize the findings to inform new procedures and approaches to be applied in future projects.

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
4	ACES will not be providing infrastructure investment for cold chain roll out. Other donors are expected to have strong interest in picking up this need. However, it is important that the investment comes concurrently or soon after TA and training to leverage ACES's momentum.	ACES should put a strong emphasis on liaising with potential investors and financiers of cold chain equipment as part of its work. There is an assumption that with ACES providing the TA and training, then there will be more than enough funding to roll out associated infrastructure. While this may be true, time is of the essence to ensure the momentum continues and that there is not too much of a time gap between learning and application of what is learned. Thus, there should be a targeted outcome of ACES work to stimulate investment for cold chain rollout.	Critical	Project	Project Manager, ACES General Manager, Defra Officer, UNEP leadership	March – December 2024	Accepted		Secure the commitment of organizations which specialize in investment in technology deployment.
5	UNEP's expert work produces very valuable tools that literally have the potential to change the world, but UNEP projects typically only have enough funds to target results in a limited number of countries. To really leverage UNEP's comparative advantage, future projects could more strategically pursue what happened organically with the Cooling Project in that	Per Lesson #3, put strong emphasis in future UNEP projects on critical tools, such as the Cooling Project's Model Regulations and its NCAP Template, on the leverage of these tools beyond the project with other donors and with large countries (the latter via their close involvement in development of the tools). While	Critical	Project	Designers of future projects, UNEP management	March – December 2024 and ongoing.	Accepted		Include in future project(s) promotion of UNEP's unique tools such as Model Regulation Guidelines as well as collaboration opportunities to ensure broader uptake

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	key documents were leveraged by others beyond the Project.	such leveraging occurred organically in the Cooling Project, it might be increased in future projects by being a part of the project design. Results achieved via such leveraging should be carefully tracked and may even become part of the project's result framework							
6	An important role of UNEP is to convene experts to prepare joint reports. Findings suggest that in the Cooling Project (though perhaps mostly occurring in follow-on work related to Cool Coalition), the Cooling Stocktaking Report process was not as organized and orderly as it could have been and authors' work was revised extensively without track change, so that they could not easily comment on changes made. Furthermore, while the Cool Coalition Platform later developed the Cooling Pledge earlier in its life, it did not have a clear metric to measure its success and was perceived by some as unfocused, mainly holding and attending many meetings.	UNEP should ensure that advocacy platforms it develops have clear metrics and clear aims. It should further ensure that group reports with outside authors developed to support advocacy and scientific consensus have a clear process that respects the role of various authors and provides them with consistent guidance on a reasonable timeframe. In particular, revisions to authors' work should be shared in track change for discussion to ensure the original meaning is not lost. Given their importance to the organization, management should review	Critical	Project	UNEP management, UNEP project teams, Cool Coalition	March – December 2024 and ongoing.	Not Accepted	The Cool Coalition released the Global Cooling Watch report (https://www.unep.org/resources/global-cooling-watch-2023) in December 2023 so the feedback received during the implementation period was only in draft form and with early edits. The report has been widely promoted and lauded, and help serve as a catalyst for the Global Cooling Pledge and framing key issues at the "Cool COP" including with UNEP Executive Director serving as a champion and many countries signing up for the pledge (https://coolcoalition.org/global-cooling-pledge/). Regular calls were conducted and consultations to allow for input and consideration of various views.	not applicable

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
		processes for these joint reports and develop guidelines to ensure an orderly process and that input and role of experts, whether volunteers or paid consultants, is adequately respected. Such work should also adhere to UNEP's science publication review process, as overseen by its Chief Scientist.							
7	UNEP may reassess its approach to financial mechanism in the future and consider: (1) combining promotion of financial mechanisms with general promotion of the advantages in lifecycle costs of efficient appliances (many may purchase products outright based on savings over the lifecycle); (2) ensuring the financial mechanism is set up so that all players in the "deal" will be satisfied, (3) achieving enough buy-in from partners, so that sales of the efficient appliances (whether with or without loan) will be substantial and scale up over time.	The financial mechanisms of the Project provided a good basis for learning, but even in the country with the most sales, Ghana, only 4,000 refrigerators were sold under the sub-program and 90% did not use loans. In each country's financial mechanisms, it seems dissatisfaction by one of the players led to the lack of success in the programme. In Rwanda, the vendors did not like forfeiting 10% for recycling and also having to pay to get the refrigerator to the recycler. Banks in Ghana were not proactive enough. In Senegal, utility	Important	Project	Project designers, UNEP unit managers and project managers and financial mechanism specialists	March – December 2024 and ongoing	Partially Accepted	By balancing the interests across parties who occasionally have competing or at least somewhat misaligned priorities, we were able to get a sufficient cohort of vendors, financiers and requisite government agency-buy in to pursue the mechanisms. Of course some will note that they would have preferred, in the case of vendors, getting 100% of the revenue but we are pursuing broader societal wins. In this case, trying to make it self-sustaining by inclusion of a fee to offset costs so that this can be market-based and not simply subsidized by grants which is a weakness in other financing projects which we aimed to remedy and have been well recognized for attempting to tackle this hurdle.	Cooling

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
		stakeholders were not fully on-board with on-bill billing.							
8	Due to concerns over intellectual property by the legal departments of both organizations, it was not possible for UNEP to sub-contract under its grants to LBNL and vice versa. Thus, the organizations had to use separate grants and this created some challenges in timing of resources. Yet, the product of joint work was some of the most impactful on the Project.	Senior management should consider the value of LBNL-UNEP collaboration and thus whether action should be taken to enable mutual sub-contracting, something now being blocked by the organizations' respective legal departments.	Important	UNEP-wide	UNEP senior management, UNEP legal department, LBNL senior management, LBNL legal department	March – September 2024	Accepted	U4E and LBNL to pursue the matter with their respective legal departments	U4E and LBNL are to pursue perspective donors on potential future joint activities. If any prove promising, both parties will raise the specific project concept and need for transfer of funds with our respective legal teams and seek to find appropriate accommodations to enable contractual arrangements between the organizations. If this proves unworkable, then as a fallback option we will pursue a formal agreement (MoU or otherwise as appropriate) to recognize this important partnership and indicate how we intend to collaborate in an in-kind fashion rather than involving transfers of funds across the parties.