

Mid-Term Review of the UNDP/GEF Project  
'A systemic approach to sustainable urbanization and resource efficiency  
in Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)' Jordan - November 2021

**INTERVIEW OUTLINE**

The Mid-Term Review is a planned part of all GEF-funded Full-Size projects.

The objectives of the review are:

- to check progress towards results
- to monitor the use of adaptive management
- to identify risks and
- to provide supportive recommendations

The review encourages open participation and presents an opportunity for critical discussion. The feedback and input you provide will be held confidential. The report will not indicate any sources of statements or data in order to maintain confidentiality.

1. Please give your name, your role in the project and a short description of your responsibilities with reference to the project.
2. In your opinion, what is the most significant accomplishment of the project? Which project actions were most effective in terms of meeting energy saving and environmental targets? Which were less effective?
3. Were national stakeholders (government, SMEs, building owners, financial institutions, etc.) accepting and actively participating in the project? Were stakeholders well informed of project progress? Did the stakeholders have an adequate role in project decision-making?
4. Have there been clear indications of increased energy and/or environmental consciousness as a result of the project? Has public awareness on climate change, renewable energy, energy efficiency and environmental issues increased as a result of the project?
5. Is the project creating long-term, sustainable benefits for Jordan? What project-created measures or actions (legislation, institutions, training, demonstrations, etc.) provide the most significant benefits?
6. Is there adequate coordination between this project and other interventions in the energy/environment sector? Has duplication of efforts been avoided?
7. Has the project encountered problems in its implementation? If so, has adaptive management been efficiently applied to meet these challenges?
8. Which lessons and good practice have emerged from the project? Are these relevant for similar projects outside of Jordan?
9. What strategy would you recommend to secure the sustainability of the project results?
10. Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

## ANNEX 8 MTR Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)*

### Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

#### Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

*Note:* The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

**To the comments received on (date) from the Midterm Review of (project name) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken

## Annex 2: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix

### EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How and why have project outcomes and strategies contributed to the achievement of the expected results? Have the project outcomes contributed to national development priorities and plans?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building EE prioritized in national legislation, development priorities and plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document, Second National Energy Efficiency Action Plan and other policy documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff, and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the project's timeframe?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Outputs, Outcomes and objective</li> <li>Project budget and timeframe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document,</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Workplans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff, and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References to stakeholders in project documentation</li> <li>Capacity assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project document</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff, and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uptake of project activities</li> <li>Co-financing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff, and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control and to what extent they have influenced outcomes and results? How appropriate and effective were the project's management strategies for these factors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barrier identification, and solutions</li> <li>Continuity of project activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff, and stakeholders</li> </ul>

**Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project's Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicators as set out in Results Framework/Logframe and tracked in project reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Site visits</li> <li>PIR</li> <li>Audit reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> <li>site visits</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>efficiency of Logframe</li> <li>logic of outputs→outcomes→objective</li> <li>type and number of outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GHG calculations</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Work plans</li> <li>Progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the assumptions made by the project right and what new assumptions that should be made could be identified?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measured savings</li> <li>Market uptake of measures</li> <li>Application of tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Work plans</li> <li>Progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> <li>site visits</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measure of expenditures against activities and results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Co-financing</li> <li>Work plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder involvement in project design and implementation</li> <li>Application of tools and knowledge</li> <li>Time, material and financial contributions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Co-financing</li> <li>Work plans</li> <li>Steering committee meetings</li> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> <li>site visits</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has COVID 19 crisis affected the implementation of the project's activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References to pandemic</li> <li>Adjustment strategies</li> <li>Duration of lock-down</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff</li> </ul>

**Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robustness of indicators</li> <li>logic of outputs→outcomes→objective</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>project document</li> <li>progress reports</li> <li>GEF guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified risks in PIR and PD,</li> <li>Robust risk recognition and rating in reports</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PIR, project document</li> <li>SC meetings</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How and to what extent have project implementation process, coordination with participating stakeholders and important aspects affected the timely project start-up, implementation and closure?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of start-up</li> <li>Continuity of management</li> <li>Stakeholder coordination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes made to strategy</li> <li>Overlaps with other projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How have local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project? What could be improved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder engagement and identification of overlaps</li> <li>Stakeholder involvement in SC and TWG meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception report</li> <li>SC meetings</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project consult and make use of skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder engagement in projects activities</li> <li>Degree of cooperation and communication among stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SC meetings</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>

**Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robustness of sustainability strategy in project design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PIR</li> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Supplementary Annexes</li> <li>interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How relevant was the project sustainability strategy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robustness of sustainability strategy in project design</li> <li>Adjustments made to project design due to sustainability during implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>SC meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market uptake of measures</li> <li>ESP and ESCO activity</li> <li>Uptake of financial incentives</li> <li>Compliance to codes</li> <li>Awareness of potential savings from EE measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Media</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> <li>site visits</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptance and integration of project outcomes, tools, knowledge and processes in government entities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception report</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>SC meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> <li>interviews with project staff and stakeholders</li> <li>site visits</li> </ul>

#### ANNEX 4: MTR Ratings Scale

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained



Mid-Term Review Report of the UNDP/GEF SURE Project for Jordan:  
'A systemic approach to Sustainable Urbanization and Resource Efficiency  
in Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)'

Annex 6 – List of Persons Interviewed

Dr. Jamal Qteishat- *Secretary General of Jordan National Building Council (JNBC)*

Eng. Moheeb Arabiyat- *Head of Sustainable Building Unit (SBU) JNBC*

Eng. Mona Balawneh- *Head of the inspection and control unit, JNBC*

Eng. Basma Al Shatti- *Head of technical assistance at Jordan Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Fund (JREEEF).*

Eng. Lina Mbaideen- *Deputy manager of JREEEF*

Eng. Rama Al Ezzi - *Executive Director of Licensing at Greater Amman Municipality (GAM) and Chairperson of steering committee.*

Eng. Ziad Abu Urabi- *Manager of Building Licensing Department - GAM and Chairman of technical committee*

Mohammad Awwad - GIS manager at Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)

Eng. Walid Shaheen- *Manager of National Energy Research Center (NEER)*

Adnan Khasawneh - Royal Scientific Society (RSS)

Maha Abu Mowais - Royal Scientific Society (RSS)

Ruba Ajjour- MRV system

Akran Khraissat- Head of Amman Urban Observatory (AUO)

Gaurav Mahindru- KPMG Kawasmy & Partners Co. – international consultant

Samer Zawaydeh – local consultant for ESCO accreditation

Majdi Khayyat- National consultant for de-risking EE investment in buildings.

Louis-Philippe Lavoie- International consultant for de-risking EE investment in buildings.

Mr. Saliou Toure- Lead Regional Technical Advisor UNDP

Mrs. Majida Al Assaf- Deputy Resident Representative UNDP

Nedal Al Ouran- Team leader UNDP

Rana Saleh- Environmental analyst UNDP

Meqdad Rababa'a- SURE Project manager

Mid-Term Review Report of the UNDP/GEF SURE Project for Jordan:  
'A systemic approach to Sustainable Urbanization and Resource Efficiency  
in Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)'

Annex 7 – List of Documents Reviewed

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document and Supplementary Annexes 1-7
4. GEF-6 Request for Project Endorsement/Approval (Jan 19, 2018)
5. GEF Endorsement (Feb.6.2018)
6. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
7. Project Inception Report
8. Project Implementation Reports (PIR's) 2020, 2021
9. Work plans 2019, 2020, 2021
- ~~10. Audit reports~~
11. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm
- ~~12. Oversight mission reports~~
- ~~13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team~~

The following documents were also reviewed:

14. MEMR Energy Strategy 2020-2030 presentation (pdf)
15. The Second National Energy Efficiency Action Plan (NEEAP) for Jordan 2018-2020 (November 2017)
16. UNDP End-of- Year Review Session for the Country Programme (November 2019) (powerpoint doc.)
17. SURE Annual Progress Reports 2019, 2020, 2021
18. SURE Quarterly Progress Report Q1 2019
19. SURE Project Highlight Report, August 25, 2020
20. Minutes of the Steering Committee Meetings: February 2019, August 2020, July 2021
21. Energy Auditing Training – Energy Fundamentals and Calculations (Prof. Ismael Al-Hinti)
22. Final Report On Green Building Rating Systems & Certifications Training (March 31, 2019)
23. Energy Audit Report of Basman Building (September 2019)
24. Energy Audit Report of WEEC Building (September 2019)
25. Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Audit Report of Ministry of Industry and Trade Building (Oct.2019)
26. Local Project Appraisal Committee Minutes, March 29, 2018
27. Combined Delivery Reports
28. Draft Report - City Database Construction for Amman –Data Collection, Analysis and Integration (Energy, Water and Waste) KPMG - 15th November 2021
29. Amman Green City Action Plan (May 2021)
30. PMR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS REPORT (ISR) (4.2.2019)

Mid-Term Review Report of the UNDP/GEF SURE Project for Jordan:  
‘A systemic approach to Sustainable Urbanization and Resource Efficiency  
in Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)’

Annex 8 – Co-financing Table

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
UNDP	UNDP	Grant	100,000	50,000	50%
UNDP	UNDP	In Kind	150,000	100,000	66.6%
Government	Ministry of Environment	Grant	800,000	800,000	100%
Government	Ministry of Environment	In Kind	200,000	0	0%
Government	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation	In Kind	3,000,000	0	0%
Government	Greater Amman Municipality	Grant	9,000,000	1,568,346	17.4%
Government	Greater Amman Municipality	In Kind	2,850,000	700,000	24.5%
Public University	WEEC	In Kind	15,000	0	0%
Private Sector	Hussein Maaitah & Partner Co Ltd	Grant	2,750,000	0	0%
Private Sector	Al Tarek Co Ltd	Grant	3,000,000	0	0%
Private Sector	Fadi Thaer Residential Building Committee	In Kind	150,000	0	0%
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22015000</b>	<b>3218346</b>	<b>14.6%</b>

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: Dr. Adil Lari

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): Austrian Consulting Engineers Group GmbH

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at Vienna, Austria (Place) on 19.November 2021 (Date)

Signature: 

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>



# Tracking Tool for GEF 6 Climate Change Mitigation Projects (At CEO Endorsement)

**Special Notes: Projects need to report on all indicators that are included in their results framework**

## Reporting on lifetime emissions avoided

**Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided:** Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made during the project's supervised implementation period totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.

**Lifetime direct post-project emissions avoided:** Lifetime direct post-project emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made outside the project's supervised implementation period, but supported by financial facilities put in place by the GEF project, totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments. These financial facilities will still be operational after the project ends, such as partial credit guarantee facilities, risk mitigation facilities, or revolving funds.

**Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down and bottom-up):** Indirect emissions reductions are those attributable to the long-term outcomes of the GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, catalytic action for replication.

Please refer to the following references for Calculating GHG Benefits of GEF Projects.

[Manual for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects](#)

[Revised Methodology for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Energy Efficiency Projects \(Version 1.0\)](#)

[Manual for Transportation Projects](#)

For LULUCF projects, the definitions of "lifetime direct and indirect" apply. Lifetime length is defined to be 20 years, unless a different number of years is deemed appropriate. For emission or removal factors (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>eq per hectare per year), use IPCC defaults or country specific factors.

## Section A. General Data

	At CEO Endorsement	
Project Title	A systemic approach to sustainable urbanization and resource efficiency in Greater Amman Municipality	
GEF ID	5543	
GEF Agency	UNDP	
Agency Project ID	9204	
Country	Jordan	
Region	MENA	
Date of Council/CEO Approval	16 2016	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 13, 2014)
GEF Grant (US\$)	2,640,000	
Date of submission of the tracking tool		Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 13, 2014)
Is the project consistent with the priorities identified in National Communications, Technology Needs Assessment, or other Enabling Activities (such as Technology Action Plans, Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) under the UNFCCC?	1	Yes = 1, No = 0

## Section B. Quantitative Outcome Indicators

### Target At CEO Endorsement

Indicator 1: Total Lifetime Direct and Indirect GHG Emissions Avoided (Tons CO <sub>2</sub> eq)		Identify Sectors, Sources and Technologies. Provide disaggregated information if possible. see Special Notes above
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided	7,229,320	
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided	467,834	
Indicator 2: Lifetime Energy Saved (Million Joules)	90,184,704,000	IEA unit converter: <a href="http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp">http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp</a> Fuel savings should be converted to energy savings by using the net calorific value of the specific fuel. End-use electricity savings should be converted to energy savings by using the conversion factor for the specific supply and distribution system. These energy savings are then totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.
Indicator 3: Increase in Renewable Energy Capacity and Production		Disaggregate by type (Wind, Biomass, Geothermal, Hydro, solar Photovoltaic, Marine power etc)
Increase in Installed RE capacity per technology (MW)		
Lifetime RE production per technology (MWh)		(IEA unit converter: <a href="http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp">http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp</a> )
Indicator 4: Number of Users of low GHG systems (Number, of which female)		Identify Sector, describe the low GHG system and technologies and explain methodology for estimation
Indicator 5: Number of Hectares under Low GHG Management Practices (Ha.)		Identify source (conservation, avoided deforestation, afforestation/reforestation), type of low GHG Management Practice and describe methodology used for estimation
Indicator 6: Time Saved in adoption of low GHG technology (Percentage)		For technologies and practices to be supported under the project (i) estimate baseline time to deployment (without project support), (ii) estimate expected time to deployment with project support and (iii) calculate % of time saved.

<b>Indicator 7: Volume of investment mobilized and leveraged by GEF for low GHG development (co-financing and additional financing) of which</b>		<b>Expected additional resources implies resources beyond co-financing committed at CEO endorsement.</b>
Public	US\$ 26,515,000	
Private	US\$ 2,150,000	
Domestic		
External		
<b>Indicator 8: Identify specific GHG reduction target (percent), if any, under any national, sectoral, local plans</b>		<b>Specify plan, area/sector (if subnational), and baseline from which reduction is expected</b>

### Section C. Qualitative Indicators

<b>Indicator 9: Degree of support for low GHG development in policy, planning and regulations</b>	<b>Baseline Rating (1-10)</b>	<b>Target Rating (1-10)</b>	<b>Identify the policy/regulations (national, sectoral, City) relevant to and supported by the project and provide rating. Baseline indicates current status (pre-project), Target is the rating level that is expected to be achieved due to project support. For guidance for qualitative ratings (In comment) move cursor over box or right click to show comment.</b>
Sustainability Plan for GAM (accompanied by Financial and Communications Strategies / Plans)	1	10	In the baseline, there is no Sustainability Plan for GAM. The project will develop such a Plan for GAM using the Urban Sustainability Framework developed by the GEF-financed Global Platform for Sustainable Cities.
<b>Indicator 10: Quality of MRV Systems</b>	<b>Baseline Rating (1-10)</b>	<b>Target Rating (1-10)</b>	<b>Provide details of coverage of MRV systems - area, type of activity for which MRV is done, and of Reporting and Verification processes. Baseline indicates current status (pre-project), Target is the rating level that is expected to be achieved due to project support. For guidance for qualitative ratings (In comment) move cursor over box or right click to show comment.</b>
Output 3.1: Development of an urban MRV system for Building Energy Codes for determination of emission reductions from investments.	3	10	MRV systems are being developed under the PMR project as well as under the First BUR. However, there are no activity- or project-level MRV systems for Building Energy Codes that the project will put in place.
<b>Indicator 11: Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development</b>	<b>Baseline Rating (1-10)</b>	<b>Target Rating (1-10)</b>	<b>Provide details of the financial mechanisms and identify the sector and the type of low GHG technology or development activity it supports. Baseline indicates current status (pre-project), Target is the rating level that is expected to be achieved due to project support. For guidance for qualitative ratings (In comment) move cursor over box or right click to show comment.</b>
Output 3.3: As part of NAMA development, assistance to the Jordan Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Fund to provide customised financial incentives to promote investments in Building Energy Codes.	3	7	JREEEF already capitalised and has an action plan to 2020 that will focus mainly on financing the installation of rooftop PV, solar water heaters and limited thermal insulation in public buildings. The project will provide technical assistance to JREEEF to develop a viable business model for incentivising building thermal insulation using an ESCO model.
Output 3.4: Identification and quantification of the effectiveness of different policy and financial derisking instruments for EE buildings using UNDP's derisking methodology (DEEL).	1	7	Today, the derisking approach to supporting private investments in building thermal insulation has not been adopted in Jordan, most probably because the approach is quite novel and because of the lack of ESCO models in Jordan. The project will develop and accredit ESCOs and also identify and quantify the effectiveness of derisking instruments that will be most suitable to catalyse investments in thermal insulation.



# Tracking Tool for GEF 6 Climate Change Mitigation Projects (At Mid-Term)

**Special Notes:** Projects need to report on all indicators that are included in their results framework at CEO Endorsement

## Reporting on lifetime emissions avoided

**Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided:** Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made **until the mid-term evaluation** totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.

Please refer to the following references for Calculating GHG Benefits of GEF Projects.

[Manual for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects](#)

[Revised Methodology for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Energy Efficiency Projects \(Version 1.0\)](#)

[Manual for Transportation Projects](#)

For LULUCF projects, the definitions of "lifetime direct and indirect" apply. Lifetime length is defined to be 20 years, unless a different number of years is deemed appropriate. For emission or removal factors (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per hectare per year), use IPCC defaults or country specific factors.

## Section A. General Data

	At Mid-Term Evaluation	
Project Title	A systemic approach to sustainable u	
GEF ID	9204	
GEF Agency	UNDP	
Agency Project ID	5543	
Country	Jordan	
Region	MENA	
Date of Council/CEO Approval	Feb 06 2018	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 13, 2014)
GEF Grant (US\$)	2,640,000	
Date of submission of the tracking tool	Dec 03 2021	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 13, 2014)
Is the project consistent with the priorities identified in National Communications, Technology Needs Assessment, or other Enabling Activities (such as Technology Action Plans, Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) under the UNFCCC?	1	Yes = 1, No = 0

## Section B. Quantitative Outcome Indicators

### Results at Mid-Term

Indicator 1: Total Lifetime Direct and Indirect GHG Emissions Avoided (Tons CO <sub>2</sub> e)	Tons CO <sub>2</sub> e	Identify Sectors, Sources and Technologies. Provide disaggregated information if possible. see Special Notes above
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided	2,257	10 yr lifecycle for streetlights, 20 yr lifecycle for building EE measures
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided	0	
Indicator 2: Lifetime Energy Saved	Million Joules	IEA unit converter: <a href="http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp">http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp</a> Fuel savings should be converted to energy savings by using the net calorific value of the specific fuel. End-use electricity savings should be converted to energy savings by using the conversion factor for the specific supply and distribution system. These energy savings are then totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.
	17,137	Lifecycle electricity savings: 2653 MWh from streetlights + 624 MWh from 2 EE renovations. Lifecycle diesel saving: 5340 GJ
Indicator 3: Increase in Renewable Energy Capacity and Production		Disaggregate by type (Wind, Biomass, Geothermal, Hydro, solar Photovoltaic, Marine power etc)
Increase in Installed RE capacity per technology (MW)		
Lifetime RE production per technology (MWh)		(IEA unit converter: <a href="http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp">http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp</a> )
Indicator 4: Number of Users of low GHG systems (Number, of which female)		Identify Sector, describe the low GHG system and technologies and explain methodology for estimation
	8860 visitors (32% women)	Visitors to 2 EE renovated government buildings
Indicator 5: Number of Hectares under Low GHG Management Practices (Ha.)		Identify source (conservation, avoided deforestation, afforestation/reforestation), type of low GHG Management Practice and describe methodology used for estimation
Indicator 6: Time Saved in adoption of low GHG technology (Percentage)		For technologies and practices to be supported under the project (i) estimate baseline time to deployment (without project support), (ii) report actual time to deployment with project support and (iii) calculate % of time saved.
Indicator 7: Volume of investment mobilized and leveraged by GEF for low GHG development (co-financing and additional financing) of which		Additional resources implies resources beyond co-financing committed at CEO endorsement.
Public	US\$ 3,068,346	GAM (grant and in-kind), Ministry of Environment (grant)
Private	US\$ 0	
Domestic		
External	US\$ 150,000	UNDP (grant and in-kind)
Indicator 8: Identify specific GHG reduction target (percent), if any, under any national, sectoral, local plans		Specify plan, area/sector (if subnational), and baseline from which reduction is expected


### Section C. Qualitative Indicators

Indicator 9: Degree of support for low GHG development in policy, planning and regulations	Baseline Rating (1-10)	Results Rating (1-10)	For all policies/sectors relevant to project activities. Identify the policy/regulations (national, sectoral) and provide rating. Guidance for qualitative rating is available at (link to CCM program Results Framework)
Output 1.1 Sustainability Plan for GAM (accompanied by Financial and Communications Strategies / Plans)	1	1	Amman Green City Action Plan (GCAP) created under EBRD project has been adopted as official sustainable plan for Amman 2022-2030
Output 2.2: Increased capacity to enforce building EE codes	1	7	Sustainable Building Unit and Building Inspection Unit established
Output 2.3: building EE code update and retrofit building guidelines	1	3	retrofit building guidelines have been issued
Indicator 10: Quality of MRV Systems	Baseline Rating (1-10)	Results Rating (1-10)	Provide details of coverage of MRV systems - area, type of activity for which MRV is done, and of Reporting and Verification processes.
Output 3.1: Development of an urban MRV system for Building Energy Codes for determination of emission reductions from investments.	3	3	MRV system launched in Feb.2019 in MoEnv. Project needs to identify and build capacity of entity responsible for reporting ER from buildings
Activity			
Indicator 11: Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development	Baseline Rating (1-10)	Results Rating (1-10)	Provide details of the financial mechanisms and identify the sector and the type of low GHG technology or development activity it supports
Output 3.3: As part of NAMA development, assistance to the Jordan Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Fund to provide customised financial incentives to promote investments in Building Energy Codes.	3	3	UNDP is working closely with JREEEF to develop comprehensive policy and financial de-risking modality for Jordan
Output 3.4: Identification and quantification of the effectiveness of different policy and financial derisking instruments for EE buildings using UNDP's derisking methodology (DEEI).	1	1	UNDP has hired international and local consultant to work along with the project team to develop the DEEI by the end of 2021.





# Tracking Tool for GEF6 Climate Change Mitigation Projects (At Terminal Evaluation)

**Special Notes: Projects need to report on all indicators that are included in their results framework**

## Reporting on lifetime emissions avoided

**Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided:** Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made during the project's supervised implementation period totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.

**Lifetime direct post-project emissions avoided:** Lifetime direct post-project emissions avoided are the emissions reductions attributable to the investments made outside the project's supervised implementation period, but supported by financial facilities put in place by the GEF project, totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments. These financial facilities will still be operational after the project ends, such as partial credit guarantee facilities, risk mitigation facilities, or revolving funds.

**Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (top-down and bottom-up):** Indirect emissions reductions are those attributable to the long-term outcomes of the GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, catalytic action for replication.

Please refer to the following references for Calculating GHG Benefits of GEF Projects.

[Manual for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects](#)

[Revised Methodology for Calculating Greenhouse Gas Benefits of GEF Energy Efficiency Projects \(Version 1.0\)](#)

[Manual for Transportation Projects](#)

For LULUCF projects, the definitions of "lifetime direct and indirect" apply. Lifetime length is defined to be 20 years, unless a different number of years is deemed appropriate. For emission or removal factors (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>eq per hectare per year), use IPCC defaults or country specific factors.

## Section A. General Data

	At Terminal Evaluation	
Project Title		
GEF ID		
GEF Agency		
Agency Project ID		
Country		
Region		
Date of Council/CEO Approval		Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 13, 2014)
GEF Grant (US\$)		
Date of submission of the tracking tool		Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 13, 2014)
Is the project consistent with the priorities identified in National Communications, Technology Needs Assessment, or other Enabling Activities (such as Technology Action Plans, Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) under the UNFCCC?		Yes = 1, No = 0

## Section B. Quantitative Outcome Indicators

### Results at Terminal Evaluation

Indicator 1: Total Lifetime Direct and Indirect GHG Emissions Avoided (Tons CO <sub>2</sub> eq)		Identify Sectors, Sources and Technologies. Provide disaggregated information if possible. see Special Notes above
Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided		
Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided		
Indicator 2: Lifetime Energy Saved		IEA unit converter: <a href="http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp">http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp</a> Fuel savings should be converted to energy savings by using the net calorific value of the specific fuel. End-use electricity savings should be converted to energy savings by using the conversion factor for the specific supply and distribution system. These energy savings are then totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.
Indicator 3: Increase in Renewable Energy Capacity and Production		Disaggregate by type (Wind, Biomass, Geothermal, Hydro, solar Photovoltaic, Marine power etc)
Increase in Installed RE capacity per technology (MW)		
Lifetime RE production per technology (MWh)		(IEA unit converter: <a href="http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp">http://www.iea.org/stats/unit.asp</a> )
Indicator 4: Number of Users of low GHG systems (Number, of which female)		Identify Sector, describe the low GHG system and technologies and explain methodology for estimation
Indicator 5: Number of Hectares under Low GHG Management Practices (Ha.)		Identify source (conservation, avoided deforestation, afforestation/reforestation), type of low GHG Management Practice and describe methodology used for estimation
Indicator 6: Time Saved in adoption of low GHG technology (Percentage)		For technologies and practices to be supported under the project (i) estimate baseline time to deployment (without project support), (ii) report actual time to deployment with project support and (iii) calculate % of time saved.

Indicator 7: Volume of investment mobilized and leveraged by GEF for low GHG development (co-financing and additional financing) of which		Expected additional resources implies resources beyond co-financing committed at CEO endorsement.
Public		
Private		
Domestic		
External		
Indicator 8: Identify specific GHG reduction target (percent), if any, under any national, sectoral, local plans		Specify plan, area/sector (if subnational), and baseline from which reduction is expected

#### Section C. Qualitative Indicators

Indicator 9: Degree of support for low GHG development in policy, planning and regulations	Target Rating (1-10)	Results Rating (1-10)	For all policies/sectors relevant to project activities. Identify the policy/regulations (national, sectoral) and provide rating. Guidance for qualitative rating is available at (link to CCM program Results Framework)
National Plan			
Sector			
Sector			
Indicator 10: Quality of MRV Systems	Target Rating (1-10)	Results Rating (1-10)	Provide details of coverage of MRV systems - area, type of activity for which MRV is done, and of Reporting and Verification processes.
Activity			
Activity			
Indicator 11: Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development	Target Rating (1-10)	Results Rating (1-10)	Provide details of the financial mechanisms and identify the sector and the type of low GHG technology or development activity it supports

ECONOMY

LARI/ADILMR  
EK-198032616

DUBAI

G31

1410

1450

57G

E

Gate

Boarding at

Gate closes at

Seat

Waiting time

EK128

05NOV

Departure

Seat

VIE - DXB

1510 57G E

Seq 0184

dnata

Flydubai

ECONOMY

BLUE

BOARDING PASS

118204904007-1

LARI/ADIL

23872019

ANMAN-ANN

F8

1800

1900

2A

A

Boarding at

Departure

Seat

06NOV

9Z143 / EK2056

Gate

Boarding at

Gate closes at

Seat

Waiting time

JTOP MLIN

Seq035

Fast Track - DXB

BUSINESS

LARI/ADILMR  
EK-198032616

DUBAI

226

1610

1650

11A

B

Gate

Boarding at

Gate closes at

Seat

Waiting time

10 NOV 2021

10NOV

BOARDING PASS

176204904007-3