Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

UN environment programme | Evaluation Office

General Information

Eval ID	741
Evaluation Manager	Karen Villafana
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF Project "Delivering the Transition to Energy Efficient Lighting in Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Outdoor Sectors in Pakistan" GEF ID 5799 (2017 – 2022)
PIMS #	
GEF ID	5799
UNEP Sub-programme	SP1 – Climate Change
GEF Focal Area	Climate Change Mitigation
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Sudhir Sharma/Manoj Kumar Muthumanickam
Office/Division	Climate Change Division
Branch & Unit	Climate Change Mitigation
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	27/09/2023
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	6
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	24/10/2024
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	16/12/2024
Implementation Plan finalized *(if different from the date above)*	04/02/2024

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 current MEPS framework does not stipulate revisions to the standards established. As such, the MEPS may be unaligned with the latest technology.	To cater for the accelerated advancements in technology, it is recommended that at least annual revisions of MEPS be undertaken. The UNEP project staff should pass this recommendation to the Ministry of Energy (Power Division) within the Government of Pakistan in an effective manner.	Critical	Partners	Government of Pakistan/Ministry of Energy (Power Division)	Medium (6 – 12 months)	Partially Accepted	While we welcome the idea of updating MEPS frequently, it is challenging to update MEPS on an annual basis. We will apprise NEECA through a formal communication on this. However, it may be kindly noted that this is	These recommendations have already been shared with NEECA. It may be noted that a presentation was also made by the evaluator to the NEECA. Further, these recommendations including the complete terminal evaluation report will

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
								a regulatory process involving lot of government consultations / cabinet approvals. Hence, adoption of this recommendation is beyond the control and mandate of UNEP.	be shared with stakeholders such as the GEF OFP, Govt of Pakistan and Ministry of Energy (Power Division). In addition these recommendations will be shared with UNEP U4E team and other agencies such as the World Bank, ADB, UNDP, UN RC office, Pakistan, etc. who are working in this domain.
2	The MEPS guidelines have yet to be approved by the Federal Cabinet. Resultantly, while the MEPS await approval by the Federal Cabinet, absence of any binding laws and effective enforcement pose risk of limited adherence to MEPS across the lighting industry.	It is recommended that NEECA push for cabinet approval of MEPS. The UNEP project staff should pass this recommendation to NEECA in an effective manner.	Critical	Partners	NEECA, Government of Pakistan	Immediate (3-6 months)	Accepted		The above communication will cover this recommendation as well
3		It is recommended that NEECA work toward the development of a future EE project in Pakistan be focused on light testing and MRV. The UNEP project staff should pass this recommendation to NEECA in an effective manner.	Important	Partners	NEECA	Short to Medium Term (6-12 months)	Accepted		The above communication will cover this recommendation as well
4	As the lighting sector in Pakistan is highly fragmented and characterized by small scale importers and assemblers, it is critical to engage these businesses in activities on improving EE lighting quality. Similarly, since the GOP has started encouraging local manufacturing of lighting products, future projects	It is recommended that the government of Pakistan promote EE lighting policies and standards which further encourage wider industry compliance with MEPs through knowledge sharing events, including conferences and seminars. The UNEP project staff should pass this recommendation to NEECA in an effective manner.	Important	Partners	NEECA	Medium term (6 – 12 months)	Accepted		The above communication will cover this recommendation as well

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
	must also engage this segment of suppliers.								
5	Another major challenge was the limited experience of the PMU staff in handling donor-funded Projects, particularly in aspects like monitoring, reporting, budget management, and extensions.	Considering the importance of EE lighting, it is recommended that NEECA set up an EE lighting directorate that is staffed by experienced staff with capacities in public sector management and private sector linkages, etc. The UNEP project staff should pass this recommendation to NEECA in an effective manner.	Critical	Partners	NEECA	Short to Medium Term (3-6 months)	Accepted		The above communication will cover this recommendation as well
6	The project was closed after two no-cost extension despite the availability of unutilized funds (USD 430,000) amounting to 27.3% of the total GEF grand value, including the USD 250,000 left for establishment of RLF. The Executive Agency did not request a third extension. However, it is important to note that the Project was able to secure a letter of assent from HBL, based on which an RLF could very well have been established and there were substantial funds left in the Project at time of Project ending.	The Evaluation Office to review the documented process for extending/prematurely closing projects with a particular focus on those with a) a substantive element that the project has not been able to implement or b) where significant funds are remaining. The Evaluation Office to confirm adequate senior involvement/approval is incorporated in the current systems.	Critical	UNEP-wide	UNEP	12 months	Not Accepted	First of all, the management team is not competent enough to decide on this as the recommendation has been made to the Evaluation office. This aspect has been continously followed by the GEF CCM team even after the project closure. As recent as 02 Dec 2024, we had a meeting involving GEF OFP (Pakistan) and NEECA. During this meeting, it was categorically confirmed that RLF has not been established yet despite having project funds for the past 2+ years since the project closure. Further it may be	

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
								noted that the TE evaluator has missed two key points: i) The project was extended twice giving additional time to complete the project activities especially the work on RLF. It may be kindly noted that the second extension of one year was exclusively meant for this aspect only. ii) PMC for the project got exhausted. and the EA was not forthcoming to bear the PMC cost for any further extension. Any further usage of component budgt to accomodate the PMC expenses would have been a violation of the GEF rules. Hence there was no other choice but to close the project in Sept 2022. If the UNEP Evaluation Office wants to take up this recommendation, it may be kindly noted that GEF IA fees is a fixed % of project	

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
								funds and multiple extension without any justifable progress is an added overhead cost to the GEF CCM team, without any additional IA fee. The objective of the RLF was to tie up with a financing institution, set-up the revolving fund mechanism and pilot the financial transaction for an actual case. However, this was not achieved during the project duration and two years beyond the project closure as well. Further the letter of assent issued by Habib Bank Limited is a non-binding one without any financial liability on either parties. This letter could not have been construed as a legal agreement between the Govt and HBL.	