



ACP EU Energy Facility II – Lessons learnt from EFI

Status – implementation till date
Findings from the monitoring

Annegrete Lausten,
Danish Energy Management
TA to the EC Delegations for the monitoring of
the Energy Facility I projects



Monitoring contract – Danish Energy Management

“TA to the EC Delegations for the implementation of the First Energy Facility’s projects” February 2009 – February 2013

“TA to the EC Delegations for the implementation of the Second Energy Facility’s projects” September 2011 – September 2015

Objective of monitoring:

- Measure how projects contribute to the general objectives of the Energy Facility.
- Measure if the project is achieving its objectives and reaching the expected results.
- Prevent bottlenecks, assess on the advance and difficulties of each project.
- Assure quality in the implementation.



Monitoring contract - Activities

- Analysis of project reports - How is each individual project performing
 - indicators follow up and comparison between similar projects
 - Follow up on evolution to
 - Prevent bottlenecks
 - Ensure quality in implementation
- Help Desk for the EU Delegations in their monitoring of the contracts under the Energy Facility: Exchanges, sharing of documents and experiences, guidance on technical aspects
- Lessons learnt, case studies, Thematic Fiches
- Seminars, website




Some key figures – Energy Facility I

Type	Amount
Original number of projects	74
Cancelled projects (#)	4
Projects granted extension (#)	47 (of which 14 have been granted 2 extensions, and 1 has been granted 3 extensions)
Projects which have ended (#)	24 (According to CRIS)
Total EC amount committed to projects	€ 195,177,758
Total EC amount paid till date	€ 107,902,557



Project status





Longer duration than foreseen

- Initially foreseen:
 - that 50 of the 70 projects would have been ended by end of 2011
 - that 6 projects would be still under implementation during 2013
- Current reality:
 - 47 of the 70 projects (67%) have been granted an extension
 - Only 24 projects were terminated by end 2011
 - 5 projects will be ending within the coming 6 months
 - Another 20 projects end before the end of 2012 (Oct. – Dec. 2012)
 - 21 projects are ending during 2013 with 9 ending in December 2013




Project reviews

	Total since beginning
Report review sheets	134
Project performance sheets	137
Projects assessed	66
Site visits	5



Assessing project performance





Strong points

- More progress is being made after initial start-up problems have been overcome
- The majority of projects carry out internal monitoring of activities
- Most projects are aware of the need to sensitise the target beneficiaries
- Good combination of training, awareness and installation of energy services
- Some projects have made a large effort to build ownership, which creates better sustainability prospects
- Some projects are emphasising the use of locally/regionally available material, in order to minimise transport cost, and thus enhance economic sustainability



Points needing further attention

- Some projects have spent little, implemented little, but have less than one year left
- Most projects are delayed – they have been too optimistic in their initial planning without taking account of the fact that delays in procurement, incomplete pre-feasibility /feasibility studies, logistical delivery problems, or weather conditions can substantially delay a project
- The project delays impact on the remaining time available to work on ensuring impact and sustainability, which are both important factors towards guaranteeing a successful outcome. Otherwise it becomes an activity-implementing project, which will have left little footprint a couple of years after project end
- Some projects lack stakeholder ownership, leading to a lack of understanding or even resistance among the target beneficiaries, impacting on project progress



Points needing further attention

- In most cases the LogFrame matrix could still be improved, to the benefit of the implementers (and monitors as well):
 - OVIs have not been quantified
 - Assumptions/risks not sufficiently developed.
 - Risks management plans do not even exist
- Some tender dossiers which have been reviewed present some shortcomings:
 - Lack of adequate requirements for guarantees, after sales support and training.
 - Technical descriptions are unclear and/or ambiguous
 - Some specifications are unnecessary – e.g. specific named software, specific type of PV cells, - these should not be necessary as long as the performance and warranties satisfy the client
 - Some functional requirements are missing – e.g. minimum illumination levels, water-proof, etc.
 - It is unclear which set of standards should be applied
 - Rejection criteria are not clear



Some recommendations

- Establish *good quality indicators*, allowing for a good internal or external monitoring of the project implementation and progress towards achieving the goals
- Take into account *potential risks* which can impact on the project implementation and possibility to reach expected outcomes, and subsequently develop a risk management plan
- It is important that issues of *sustainability* be taken into consideration when dealing with financing constraints, e.g. if a subvention scheme is being set up within the project
- When *subcontracting* the project management must develop terms of reference which describe clearly and in detail the product wanted, and thus include for example capacity to deliver, considerable experience in the field concerned, guarantee, etc.
- The *EC contribution* should not only be visible through the use of logos, but also by mentioning it at each gathering and community mobilisation/awareness meeting



Thank you

ACP EU Energy Facility Monitoring:
www.energyfacilitymonitoring.eu