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| **Terms of reference** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| GENERAL INFORMATION |
| **Title:** **INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF MICROTURBINE COGENERATION PROJECT**  **Project Name :**  Microturbine Cogeneration Technology Application Project (MCTAP)  **Reports to:** Programme manager, Environment Unit UNDP  **Duty Station:** Jakarta & home based  **Expected Places of Travel (if applicable):** within Indonesia  **Duration of Assignment:** From 27th March 2014 to: 15th May 2014 (25 working days)  **REQUIRED DOCUMENT FROM HIRING UNIT**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | x | TERMS OF REFERENCE | | 8 | **CONFIRMATION OF CATEGORY OF LOCAL CONSULTANT , please select :**   1. Junior Consultant 2. Support Consultant 3. Support Specialist 4. Senior Specialist 5. Expert/ Advisor   **CATEGORY OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT , please select :**   1. Junior Specialist 2. Specialist 3. **Senior Specialist** | | x | APPROVED e-requisition |   **REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION FROM CONSULTANT**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | x | CV | | x | Copy of education certificate | | x | Completed financial proposal | | x | Completed technical proposal |   **Need for presence of IC consultant in office:**  X partial (Jakarta and Home-Based)  ☐intermittent (explain)  ☐full time/office based (needs justification from the Requesting Unit)  **Provision of Support Services:**  Office space: ☐ Yes x No  Equipment (laptop etc): ☐Yes x No  Secretarial Services ☐Yes x No  If yes has been checked, indicate here who will be responsible for providing the support services: < Enter name >  Signature of the Budget Owner:…………………………………. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **BACKGROUND** |
| Cogeneration technology has only been popular amongst the big industries mainly because of its cost effectiveness due to its scale of operation i.e. large-scale power and heating generation facilities, an ideal solution to meet captive power and heat energy demand. With the availability of large natural gas resources, cogeneration combined with captive power and heat applications, is definitely a promising market for the promotion of Microturbine Cogeneration Technology (MCT) as it offers a new perspective on clean, efficient and high quality of on-site power and heat generation.  Microturbine Cogeneration Technology Application Project (MCTAP) is being implemented by the Energy Technology Center (BBTE) of Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT) from 2009-2013 with the support from United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This project aims to assist the Government of Indonesia in the development and application of MCT as alternative and clean energy technologies which produce less greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. MCTAP was designed to remove key market, policy, technical and financial barriers to MCT development and application in the country. The project also focuses of cost-reduction and capacity building activities as part of strategy apart from pilot demonstration of MCT in various feasible applications. The overall objective of the MCTAP is the reduction of the long-term cost of MCT in order to accelerate the entry and increase the share of MCT in the Indonesian market.  **Expected outcomes of MCTAP**   * ***Component Activity 1: Technology Assessment and MCT Application Development***   Outcome 1: Through understanding and appreciation of technology options and their environmental impacts of MCT systems by ICE sector, government and other stakeholders.   * + - * ***Component Activity 2: MCT Demonstration & Market Development***   Outcome 2: Establishment of a critical mass of demonstration projects that will provide detailed information of MCT operations, energy savings and environmental impacts to enterprises interested MCT systems from ICE sectors   * + - * ***Component Activity 3: Technical Support for MCT Financing***   Outcome 3: Availability of financial and institutional support to encourage enterprises from ICE sector to adopt energy efficient MCT systems   * + - * ***Component Activity 4: Policy & Institutional Support***   Outcome 4: Promulgation of and compliance to regulations that encourage adoption of MCT systems   * + - * ***Component Activity 5: MCT Promotion***   Outcome 5: Enhanced awareness of the public and other stakeholders   * + - * ***Component Activity 6: Technical Support for Local MCT Industry***   Outcome 6: Improved local vocational, technical; and managerial capacity to manage and sustain operations of MCT for EC&EE practices in the ICE sectors  In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.  **Objectives of the evaluation**  The UNDP Indonesia is initiating this evaluation to determine to what extent the project has achieved its objectives and has removed barriers to microturbine market development and utilization in Indonesia. It is intended to analyze and assess the relevance, sustainability, impact and effectiveness of the strategies, project design, implementation methodologies and resource allocations that have been adopted for the purpose of achieving the objectives stated in the project document. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK** |
| 1. **Scope of Evaluation**   The scope of the Final Evaluation (FE) covers the entire project and its components as well as the co-financed components of the project.  The FE will assess the Project implementation taking into account the status of the project activities and outputs and the resource disbursements **made up to February 31, 2014**.  The review will involve analysis at two levels: component level and project level.  **Component level:** progress against each outcome, output, activity (including sub-activities) and impact indicators listed in the project document along with the following shall be assessed:   * Whether there is effective relationship and communication between/among components so that data, information, lessons learned, best practices and outputs are shared efficiently, including cross-cutting issues. * Whether the performance measurement indicators and targets used in the project monitoring system are specific, measurable, achievable, reasonable and time-bounded to achieve desired project outcomes. * Whether the use of consultants has been successful in achieving component outputs.   The evaluation will include such aspects as appropriateness and relevance of work plan, compliance with the work and financial plan with budget allocation, timeliness of disbursements, procurement, coordination among project team members and committees, and the UNDP country office support. Any issue or factor that has impeded or accelerated the implementation of the project or any of its components, including actions taken and resolutions made should be highlighted.    On the project level, it will assess the project performance in terms of: (a.) Progress towards achievement of results, (b.) Factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results, (c.) Project Management framework, and (d.) Strategic partnerships.   * 1. *Progress towards achievement of results* (internal and within project’s control) * Is the Project making satisfactory progress in achieving project outputs vis-à-vis the targets and related delivery of inputs and activities? * Are the direct partners and project consultants able to provide necessary inputs or achieve results? * Given the level of achievement of outputs and related inputs and activities to date, is the Project likely to achieve its Immediate Purpose and Development Objectives? * Are there critical issues relating to achievement of project results that have been pending and need immediate attention in the next period of implementation?      * 1. *Factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results* (beyond the Project’s immediate control or project-design factors that influence outcomes and results) * Is the project implementation and achievement of results proceeding well and according to plan, or are there any outstanding issues, obstacles, bottlenecks, etc. on the consumer, government or private sector or the microhydro industry as a whole that are affecting the successful implementation and achievement of project results? * To what extent does the broader policy environment remain conducive to achieving expected project results, including existing and planned legislations, rules, regulations, policy guidelines and government priorities? * Is the project logical framework and design still relevant in the light of the project experience to date? * Is the project well-placed and integrated within the national government development strategies, such as community development, poverty reduction, etc., and related global development programs to which the project implementation should align? * Do the Project’s purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or components in the project design that need to be reviewed and updated?   1. *Project management* (adaptive management framework) * Are the project management arrangements adequate and appropriate? * How effectively is the project managed at all levels? Is it results-based and innovative? * Do the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system, operate as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making? * Is technical assistance and support from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely? * Validate whether the risks originally identified in the project document and, currently in the Annual Project Report, are the most critical and the assessments and risk ratings placed are reasonable. * Describe additional risks identified during the evaluation, if any, and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted. * Assess the use of the project logical framework and work plans as management tools and in meeting with UNDP-GEF requirements in planning and reporting. * Assess the use of electronic information and communication technologies in the implementation and management of the project. * How have the Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?   1. *Strategic partnerships* (project positioning and leveraging) * Are the project partners and their other similar engagements in the implementation, strategically and optimally positioned and effectively leveraged to achieve maximum effect of the RE program objectives for the country? * Asses how project partners, stakeholders and co-financing institutions are involved in the Project’s adaptive management framework. * Identify opportunities for stronger collaboration and substantive partnerships to enhance the project’s achievement of results and outcomes.   1. Are the project information and progress of activities disseminated to project partners and stakeholders? Are there areas to improve in the collaboration and partnership mechanisms?  1. **Evaluation Methodology**   The Final Review Team is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. Review relevant project documents and reports will be based on the following sources of information: review of documents related to the Project and structured interviews with knowledgeable parties  The Evaluation Team will conduct an opening meeting with the National Project Director (NPD), Deputy NPD-I, Deputy NPD-II, National Project Manager,Team Leaders and, experts to be followed by an “exit” interview to discuss the findings of the assessment prior to the submission of the draft Final Report.  Prior to engagement and visiting the Project Management Office, the Final Review Team shall receive all the relevant documents including at least:   * MCTAP Project Document and Project Brief * Inception Report * Annual Work and Financial Plans * Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) for 2007, 2008, 2009 and Quarterly Reports   To provide more details, as may be needed, the following will be made available for access by the Final Review Team:     * Executive summary of all quarterly reports * Internal monitoring results * Terms of Reference for past consultants’ assignments and summary of the results * Past audit reports   The Final Review Team should at least interview the following people:   * National Project Director * Deputy NPD-I, and Deputy NPD-II * National Project Manager * Team Leaders * Experts * Project Administrative Officer * Project Financial Officer * PSC Members * Board Members * UNDP Country Office in Indonesia in-charge of the MCTAP Project   With the aim of having an objective and independent evaluation, the Final Review Team is expected to conduct the project review according to international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group.   1. **Review Team**   The Final Review Team will be composed of one International Lead Consultant and one National Consultant (as assistant). The Team is expected to combine international standards of evaluation expertise, excellent knowledge of the RE and Climate Change projects and national context of RE project and program implementation in Indonesia. The team should review the provided project documents and publications. The main sources of information will be provided by MCTAP Project Management Unit. Interviews with various stakeholders and field visits will add important information to the evaluation. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants.  **International Expert**  The International shall be responsible for completing and delegating tasks as appropriate for the terminal evaluation to the National counterpart. He/she will ensure the timely submission of the first draft and the final version of the terminal evaluation with incorporated comments from UNDP and others.  **National Counterpart**  The National counterpart will, jointly with, and under the supervision of the International consultant, support the evaluation. He/she will be responsible to review documents, translate necessary documents and interpret interviews, meetings and other relevant events for the International consultant. He/she will work as a liaison for stakeholders of the project and ensures all stakeholders of the project are aware of the purposes and methods of the evaluation and ensures all meetings and interviews take place in a timely and effective manner. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS** |
| At the minimum, the International Consultant of the Final Evaluation (FE) Team shall have the following professional background and responsibilities:  **International Lead Consultant**   * Post-Graduate in Engineering, Management or Business * Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized experience in energy efficiency and climate change projects * At least 3 years technical experience in power generation and/or cogeneration engineering or operations. * Technical experience in the application of microturbines in power generation and/or cogeneration and/or Microturbine Cogeneration Technology is advantageous as well as * Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy * Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations. * Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time * Familiar with developing countries context or regional situations relevant to that of Indonesia * Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported EE/RE and climate change projects * Comprehensive knowledge of international Energy Efficiency (EE)/ Renewable Energy (RE) industry best practices * Very good report writing skills in English   **Responsibilities**   * Documentation of the review * Leading the FE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the review * Deciding on division of labor within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports * Use of best practice review and evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation * Leading presentation of the draft review findings and recommendations in-country * Conducting the debriefing for the UNDP Country Office in Jakarta and MCTAP Project Management * Leading the drafting and finalization of the FE Report * Validate and complete appropriate sections in tracking tool for mid-term review of climate change mitigation projects   The members of the Team must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of the UNDP/GEF assistance. Therefore, candidates who had any direct involvement with the implementation of the WHyPGen Project will not be considered. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **EXPECTED RESULTS** |
| **Final Evaluation Schedule and Deliverables**  A review report will be produced after 25 working days, but not later than 15 May 2014. The report shall highlight important observations, analysis of information and key conclusions including its recommendations as mentioned earlier. Based on the scope of the FE described above, the evaluation report will include, among others:   * Findings on the project implementation achievements, challenges, and difficulties to date; * Assessments of the progress made towards the attainment of outcomes; * Recommendations for modifications and the future course of action; * Lessons learned from the project structure, coordination between different agencies, experience of the implementation, and output/outcome and,   The report will be initially shared with the National Project Director and National Project Manager to solicit comments or clarifications and will be presented to the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Jakarta for further deliberations.  **There will be two main deliverables:**   * Based on agreed FE work plan, the consultant should provide FE report, including an executive summary, fulfilling the review requirements set out in this Terms of Reference (TOR). The final report is to be cleared and accepted by UNDP CO in Jakarta before final payment. The final report (including executive summary, and annexes) should not exceed 50 pages.   The review report outline should be structured along the following lines:  1. Executive summary  2. Introduction  3. The project and its development context  4. Findings and Conclusions  4.1 Project formulation  4.2 Implementation  4.3 Results  5. Completed tracking tool  6. Conclusions on the findings, observations and results of MTR  7. Lessons learned  8. Recommendations  9. Annexes  More guidance on the GEF project review criteria and explanation of terminology provided in the Annex 1.   * A power-point presentation of the findings of the review. Depending upon the complexity of the review findings, UNDP CO in Jakarata may consider organizing a half-day stakeholders meeting at which to make a presentation to the partners and stakeholders.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Deliverables/ Outputs** | **Target Due Dates** | **Payment** | | 1. Upon acceptance of consultant’s proposed Final Evaluation work plan by MCTAP and UNDP | **01 April 2014** | **30%** | | 1. Upon acceptance of Final version of Final Evaluatin report by UNDP. | **10 th May 2014** | **70%** | |

**ANNEX 1 - Guidance on the GEF Project review criteria and explanation of terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Evaluations**

This Annex providing more detailed guidance on the GEF Project review criteria and explanation of terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Evaluations is an integral part of this TOR.

**I Project Review Criteria**

Please note that some of the categories in the findings and conclusions need to be rated in conformity with the GEF guidelines for final evaluations.

**1. Executive summary**

* Brief description of project
* Context and purpose of the review/evaluation
* Main conclusions, ratings, recommendations and lessons learned

**2. Introduction**

* Purpose of the review/evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* Methodology of the review/evaluation
* Structure of the review/evaluation

**3. The project(s) and its development context**

* Project start and its duration
* Problems that the project seek to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected

**4. Findings and Conclusions**

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.

* 1. **Project Formulation**
* Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
* Country-ownership/Driveness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
* Stakeholder participation (R). Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
* Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
* Other aspects. To assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

**4.2. Project Implementation**

* Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

1. The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities if required.
2. Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
3. The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
4. The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
5. Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

* Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal review/evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and review/evaluation reports where applicable.
* Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

1. The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
2. Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
3. The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
4. Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

* Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

1. The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
2. The cost-effectiveness of achievements
3. Financial management (including disbursement issues)
4. Co-financing [[1]](#footnote-1)

* Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial, environmental and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.
* Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

**4.3. Results**

* Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R*):* Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the reviewers/evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.
* This section should also include reviews of the following:
  + Sustainability*:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
  + Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff.
  + The positive and negative results, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to-medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact, including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.

**5. Recommendations**

1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and review/evaluation of the project
2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

**6. Lessons learned**

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

**7. Review/Evaluation report Annexes**

* Review/Evaluation TORs
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

**II Explanation of Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Reviews/Evaluations**

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

* The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans.

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

* Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
* Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
* Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
* The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
* The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworksin line with the project’s objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

* The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
* Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
* Project’s collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies thathave an interest orstake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

* Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns.

Consultation and stakeholder participation

* Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and review/evaluation of project activities.

Stakeholder participation

* Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
* Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
* Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

* Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy
* Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives)
* Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector
* Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives
* Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits
* Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.)
* Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)
* Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities
* Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

* Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc)
* Expansion of demonstration projects
* Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project’s achievements in the country or other regions
* Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project’s outcomes in other regions

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.

Effective financial plans include:

* Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing*[[2]](#footnote-2)*.
* Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
* Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits

*Co-financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to GEF Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

* Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding) and securing co-funding and associated funding
* The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned
* The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring, Review & Evaluation**.

Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.

Monitoring, Review and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

Table A1: Financial Planning Co-financing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co financing (Type/Source)** | **IA own  Financing (million USD)** | | **Government**  **(million USD)** | | **Other\***  **(million USD)** | | **Total  (million USD)** | | **Total**  **Disbursement (million USD)** | |
| Planned | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity investments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (\*) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

## Leveraged Resources -

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

1. Please see guidelines at the end of this Annex 1, Part II Table A1 “Financial Planning Co-financing” for reporting of co-financing [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)