

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00100156
Portfolio/Project Title:	Enabling Implementation of Nauru Energy Roadmap
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-02-01 / 2020-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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 team undertook some horizon scanning over the life of the project and identified the following opportunities and changes in the development context:

(i) Regarding the number of new primary legislation (acts) related to the energy sector (output indicator 2.1) - The original Nauru Energy Road Map (NERM) includes several planned activities directly or indirectly related to primary and secondary legislation including supporting regulations for the NUC Act, a Petroleum Act, legislation for Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS) and energy labelling, etc. Except for draft Nauru Utilities Corporation (NUC) Power System Rules and Regulations it does not appear that any of these activities have been undertaken nor initiated. Tentatively they appear all to be potentially relevant, but this is to be assessed as part of the legislative gap analysis.

(ii) Regarding the number of new secondary legislation (regulation) related to residential solar PV (output indicator 2.2) - While the Nauru Utilities Corporation Act 2011 makes provision for regulations, currently NUC do not have any regulations. Standardized templates for agreement related to rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) and Power Purchase Agreements (PPA) respectively have been prepared (apparently with support from IUCN) and submitted to the Department of Justice and Border Control (DJBC) for approval. Draft NUC Power System Rules and Regulations were prepared several years ago, but these were not finalized/endorsed by Cabinet.

(iii) With regards to the number of new technical standards (specification, test method, practice/procedure and/or guide) developed or adopted and the number of people trained on new energy legislation and regulation and technical standards for residential solar PV systems (output indicators 3.1 and 4.1) - Technical standards are mandatory technical regulations and it seems suboptimal to prepare such for embedded renewable energy based generation when NUC has no regulations on basic matters such as right of access to customers premises, metering, payment of bills, fraud, national electricity code, etc. Thus, it is recommended expanding the planned activities related to Output 3 & 4, specifically review the draft NUC Power System Rules and Regulations and update these as appropriate including related to embedded solar energy based generation and prepare training materials and undertake training on NUC regulations including related to embedded solar energy based generation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 is aligned to Outcome 1, and it supports output indicator 1.5 i.e. Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially of f-grid sources of renewable energy).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	NauruProDoc-Final061216v3_789_302 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NauruProDoc-Final061216v3_789_302.doc)	emma.sale@undp.org	9/14/2019 12:50:00 AM

Relevant

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

Targeted groups were engaged through stakeholder consultation and beneficiary feedback was crucial for achieving the following:

- (i) Establishment of the Energy Unit in July 2017. The Energy Unit consists of the Director for Climate Change and Energy and an Energy Officer;
- (ii) Review of the Nauru Energy Road Map (NERM) 2014-2020 and preparation of an Updated Nauru Energy Road Map 2018-2020 including bilateral consultations with key stakeholders and the NERM Review Consultation Workshop that was held the 14 November 2017; and
- (iii) Undertaking of a Legislative Gap Analysis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

(i) It was considered appropriate that the project applied a comprehensive approach to the energy sector. Therefore, the project began by supporting a review of the Nauru energy sector plan. Among others the review identified issues related to the structure of the initial sector plan, which was addressed in an updated energy sector plan that also was supported by the project;

(ii) Furthermore, to review, reconfirm and detail the need for energy sector wide legislation and regulations for residential solar PV, a sector wide legislative gap analysis firstly was undertaken;

(iii) The project design includes support for preparation of technical standards for embedded renewable energy based electricity generation. However, it was agreed that it was suboptimal to prepare such when NUC has no regulations on basic matters such as right of access to customers premises, metering, payment of bills, fraud, national electricity code, etc. Thus, it was agreed to expand the planned activities related to Output 3 & 4, specifically review the draft NUC Power System Rules and Regulations and update these as appropriate including related to embedded solar energy based generation and prepare training materials and undertake training on NUC regulations including related to embedded solar energy based generation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

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 has potential to scale up in the future and to meaningfully contribute to development change. The project was designed against specific baselines where imported petroleum products are the main energy source in Nauru. Although Nauru is 100% electrified, renewable energy contributes around 3% to electricity supply with the remaining 97% provided by diesel generators. The institutional roles and responsibilities of the various players in the energy sector have not been well defined, coordination mechanisms have not been operationalized, there is a lack of formal mandate for the Government department carrying out national policy and planning functions, and the processes and procedures are not sufficiently developed and in some cases, they are unclear. In addition, the functioning of institutions is constrained by limited financial resources and staff capacity. Many policies and legislation impacting the energy development on the island have been introduced since 2005 through the economic reform programme. However, these predominantly focus on electricity supply and lack attention to petroleum and renewable energy supply, including fuel handling, storage and distribution. In early 2012 the Nauru Government requested technical support in the development of an Energy Road Map. The Nauru Energy Sector Road Map (NERSM) 2014-2020 was developed and endorsed by Cabinet in 2014 and now serve as an implementation plan for Nauru's Energy Policy Framework from 2009. The targets of the NERSM by 2020 are: 1) 24/7 grid electricity supply with minimal interruptions; 2) 50% of grid electricity supplied from renewable energy sources; and 3) 30% improvement in energy efficiency in the residential, commercial and government sectors.

The focus of this project is assisting in the establishment of an enabling environment for the implementation of the NERSM. The project will consist of institutional, legislative and regulatory, technical and awareness and capacity development components and associated activities. The expected results are as follows: 1) impact: reliable, affordable, secure and sustainable energy supply to meet the socioeconomic development needs of Nauru; 2) outcome: an enabling environment for Nauru Energy Sector Road Map implementation; and 3) outputs: i) Energy Unit, Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment established and operational; ii) energy sector wide legislation and regulations for residential solar photovoltaic systems established; iii) technical standards developed or adopted for residential solar photovoltaic systems; iv) capacity developed on new energy legislation and regulation and technical standards for residential solar photovoltaic systems; and v) effective project

-----*

management.

The project supported a review and update of the energy sector plan. The Govt of Nauru is going to use the updated energy sector plan as a resource mobilization tool. Deliverables from the project including the review of the energy sector plan, updated energy sector plan and legislative gap analysis have been used as input towards the design of a concept note for the US\$3.3 million GEF financed Supporting Mainstreamed Achievement of Roadmap Targets on Energy in Nauru (SMARTEN).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

No gender specific activity was undertaken i.e. activity 2.3 'gender survey and assessment'.

Management Response:

The nature of this project was to meet design a Roadmap so did not require Gender interventions such as that for the community based projects

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 Substantial and 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 Substantial and 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, Substantial, 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 does not have any social and environmental risks.

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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or 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:

The project did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

The project M&E plan was partially applied throughout the project life. Key reporting mechanisms used to inform progress towards results and adaptive management changes include: quarterly progress reporting against indicators in the project results framework, quarterly monitoring summaries, financial expense reporting, annual work plan, annual budget and budget review. Sex dis-aggregated data was not collected. [Quarterly and monthly progress reports are uploaded via the old QA tab.]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The Project Board meeting was conducted in Nauru on 11th December 2018. The minutes of the meeting are on file. The project progress report was submitted to the Board for the meeting. [The board meeting minutes is uploaded via the old QA tab.]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 actively monitored risks every quarter in cluding consulting with key stakeholders at least ann ually to identify continuing and emerging risks to proj ect implementation and to assess if the main assum ptions remain valid.

The project risk log is updated every quarter and for ms part of quarterly progress reports.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

Adequate resources were mobilized, and payments made to achieve the intended results.

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 inputs were procured and delivered on time. Consultants were hired and delivered on time.

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 there is no evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

[According to the final evaluation report, page 35].
[The project deliverables are uploaded via the old Q
A tab.]

Project results and outputs:

- In July 2017, the Energy Unit was established as the sixth unit of the DCIE. Initially it was headed by the Director of Climate Change. In July 2018, a new Energy Director, Mr. Midhun Ajaykumar, was recruited. Energy Unit is fully integrated within the DCIE and funded by the DCIE budget. The Project Management Consultant, at times de facto serving also as an Energy Officer to the Energy Unit, is funded by the Project.

- In addition to originally planned activities, and as per the request of DCIE, NERM 2014 – 2020 was reviewed and an updated NERM 2018 – 2020 was developed and endorsed by the Cabinet in February 2018.

- Establishment of the ad hoc governmental NERM Coordination Committee was supported and TOR of the Committee was drafted.

- The Legislative Gap Analysis of the Nauru Energy Sector was finalized in February 2018.

- NUC Regulations were developed in a period between June 2018 and May 2019 based on the unfinished 2012 draft regulations. These newly developed NUC Regulations are much broader than the originally planned residential PV only regulation, and they comprise basically a full Electricity Grid Code. Drafts of the NUC Regulations were subject to a series of wide stakeholder consultations, and detailed reviews and feedback from local as well as external stakeholders.

- Review of International and Pacific Island Region Technical Standards on Solar PV Power was prepared in 2018.

Subsequently, PV Technical Standards for Nauru were developed based on abridged versions of the PV guidelines developed by the Sustainable Energy Industry Association of the Pacific Islands (SEI-API) and the Pacific Power Association (PPA). PV Technical Standards are structured on 74 pages in five main chapters that include:

1. PV component specifications;
2. Grid-Connected PV Systems: System Design Guidelines;
3. Grid-Connected PV Systems: System Installation Guidelines;
4. Grid-Connected PV: Operations and Maintenance Guideline; and
5. Utility-Scale Grid Energy Storage Guideline.

The Project did not develop the planned primary energy legislation. This was due to the lack of consensus

rgy legislation. This was due to the lack of consensus on its priority among local governmental stakeholders, and due to the lack of available budget, after other additional prioritized activities have been implemented and delivered (see above). However, the results framework was not formally updated to accommodate this modification.

The capacity training on new NUC regulations and PV standards was not delivered due to their delayed delivery at the very end of the project implementation period (May 2019). However, an agreement has been reached with NUC, which was intensively involved in their development, that NUC will conduct the capacity trainings. Some training was delivered as part of the Consultation Workshop on Proposed Draft Regulations for NUC held on August 14, 2018. It should be noted that there is a very limited number of PV/electricity installers in Nauru, who are the primary target audience. They are housed with NUC, and in addition to the NUC, there is one skilled independent energy professional/installer only.

The main final Project deliverables have been published online at the Pacific Regional Data Repository (PRDR) for Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) website at <http://prdrse4all.spc.int>. Published deliverables include as of June 2019 finalized/approved documents, including the Nauru Energy Road Map 2018 – 2020, Legislative Gap Analysis Report – Nauru Energy Sector 2018, and Review of Nauru Energy Road Map 2014 – 2020.

The Project supported awareness rising and dissemination of the updated NERM 2018 – 2020. In total 400 hard copies of the updated NERM 2018 – 2020 were published and distributed among local stakeholders. NERM promotional materials were produced, including fold-out banners, posters, brochures, t-shirts, pens, cups and USB flash drives. Several items were showcased during the 49th Pacific Islands Forum Leaders Meeting held in Nauru on September 3 - 6, 2018, and at several other occasions.

The project delivered additional results, namely:

- Review of the NERM 2014 - 2020;
- Updated NERM 2018 – 2020; and
- New NUC Regulations are much broader than originally planned. They include also basically a full grid code and do not address only residential PV, as originally planned for.

Despite the fact that the primary energy legislation that was planned to coordinate the roles of key stakeholders was not developed due to their low prioritization, and that regulation/PV standards capacity traini

ngs were not yet delivered, except for the consultati on workshops, but taking into account that additional activities were delivered, the overall quality of projec t results and outputs is rated Satisfactory.

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:

Project monitoring discussions with Government of Nauru and GIZ have been ongoing since project co mmencement and follow-up actions including review of work-plan and budgets done accordingly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

As stated previously, targeted groups were engaged through stakeholder consultation and beneficiary feedback was crucial in achieving the following:

- (i) Establishment of the Energy Unit in July 2017. The Energy Unit consists of the Director for Climate Change and Energy and an Energy Officer;
- (ii) Review the Nauru Energy Road Map (NERM) 2014-2020;
- (iii) Preparation of an Updated Nauru Energy Road Map 2018-2020; and
- (iv) Undertaking of a Legislative Gap Analysis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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 is a DIM project hence UNDP system was utilized for procurement, monitoring and evaluation.

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:

Local project stakeholders and implementing partners were properly selected. All local key stakeholders were identified and assigned a role in project implementation, namely DCIE, NUC, and DJBC, as well as other stakeholders such as the Planning and Aid Division of the Department of Finance. Capacity strengthening of DCIE to implement NERM, with development of the enabling legislation, PV regulations and PV technical standards, constitute core of the Project.

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:

[According to the project evaluation report, page 42]

Prospects of sustainability:

1) Financial resources: Full implementation of all NERM targets will require significant investment. This is not feasible for Nauru without international assistance. As mentioned above, the NERM implementation is on top of governmental priorities, and the Government of Nauru is developing new projects with international development partners and donors, including UNDP and ADB, to financially support and assist Nauru in reaching NERM targets. Nauru, due to its small size, being the third smallest independent state worldwide, has a unique position. It was able to attract substantial grant financing from international donors, such as the EU and New Zealand funded 1.152 MWp PV farm, and a new GCF/ADB 34 mil USD grant for 6 MWp PV farm²⁵ with 2.5 MW battery pending for approval. All follow-up projects supporting PV installations will benefit from developed projects results and namely from new NUC Regulations and PV Technical Standards.

This UNDP/GIZ project focused on enabling the implementation of the NERM. The only project component that will require post-project financing to secure its sustainability is the funding for the Energy Unit. Since the Energy Unit, that is fully integrated within the DCIE structure and is financed by its budget, has already demonstrated its benefits in ability to develop new projects attractive for international donors, the risk of lack of post-project financing for the Energy Unit is rated low.

Prospects of financial resources sustainability is rated Likely.

2) Socio-political sustainability: Since the NERM implementation is a top governmental priority, and there are several ongoing projects that support reaching NERM targets, and others are under development, and interim NERM results already demonstrated their benefits, such as significantly improved quality of power supply, and expansion of PV, the socio-political risk is rated low, and the socio-political sustainability is rated Likely.

3) Institutional framework and governance sustainability: The Project directly supported institutional strengthening by establishing and staffing the Energy Unit. Because there was a lack of suitable qualified experts in Nauru, the Energy Director was internationally recruited. However, since he is not a permanent resident of Nauru, there is a question if DCIE will be able to sustain and develop institutional arrangements with ...

die to recruit one day his potential successor with sufficient expertise, after his contract will expire. There are several options: to continue international recruiting, hands-on training provided to local staff/Energy Officer on relevant energy aspects, and in the long-term to support selected candidates in energy/energy efficiency/renewable energy studies/intensive training. Institutional framework and governance sustainability is rated Likely.

4) Environmental sustainability: Since the Project directly supported the development of an enabling framework for NERM implementation, and renewable energy and energy efficiency is among three main NERM's targets, environmental risks of the Project are negligible. The Project was designed to reduce use of imported oil in Nauru and thus to reduce associated environmental risks. Environmental sustainability is rated Likely.

Overall prospects of sustainability of delivered project results are rated Likely.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationNERMfinalv2_789_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationNERMfinalv2_789_320.pdf)	emma.sale@undp.org	9/14/2019 1:36:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments