|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Terms of reference**  |   |

|  |
| --- |
| GENERAL INFORMATION  |
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|  |
| --- |
| 1. **BACKGROUND**
 |
| The country’s Ministry of Energy & Mineral Resources estimates a total potential of 448 MW of wind power generation in areas with best wind conditions such as in the south coastal areas of South Sulawesi and Nusa Tenggara. Previous studies by the US National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) shows excellent potential for wind power generation in the country at areas near 9o to 10o S latitude. Wind speeds in these areas range from 6.3 – 10.1 m/s and a stand-alone wind power density of 300 – 1,000 W/m2 at 30 m altitude. Prevailing wind direction is from the east at 90o. The ASEAN Center for Energy estimates this at 480 MW for 3 – 5 m/s wind speeds. In 2008, the total installed power generation capacity in the grid systems of PLN that are located in the wind rich areas of East Nusa Tenggara, South and West Sulawesi, Maluku and Papua, was 285.7 MW. During the same year, the net effective power generation capacity (net dependable capacity) was 246.0 MW; total power generation was 936.1 GWh; average peak demand was 182.2 MW; and average load factor was 54.6% of installed capacity. This situation shows there is still a lot of unexplored wind potential in Indonesia for power generation.In order to remove the barriers to the sustainable investment of wind power generation, the WHyPGen project (2012-2015) wass initiated with funding support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNDP; and implemented by the Center for Energy Technology (B2TE) at the Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT). The project aims to promote the adoption of Wind Hybrid Power Generation (WHyPGen) technology through the facilitation of commercial on-grid WHyPGen systems for on-grid power supply within the Indonesian market, and when and where possible pass on the replication to the electricity markets in other countries such as those in the ASEAN region. The project is on the promotion, development, application and facilitation of the commercialization of a cost-effective system of utilizing Indonesia’s wind energy resource. It focuses on cost-effective and potentially commercially viable grid-connected wind-diesel hybrid power generation. The project is comprised of several barrier removal activities which would substantially reduce any risk in the adoption of WHyPGen technology. It is designed to facilitate close coordination and consultation of the relevant stakeholders in each of the project activities. The activities include those aimed at enhancing the local technical capacity to improve understanding and implementation of all aspects of WHyPGen designs, financing, installations and operations; building effective awareness programs targeted to optimize technology diffusion; enhancing the confidence of financing institutions to reduce risks of loans to finance WHyPGen projects; and enforcing developed policies and regulations to reduce the regulatory efforts of WHyPGen project implementations. During the implementation, in addition to GEF fund of USD 2,156,200 and UNDP fund of USD 150,000; the project will be supported by in-kind contribution from the government implementing partner (BPPT) to an amount of USD 1,334,600 and parallel funding from private sector to an amount of USD 36,000,000. Thus, total resources for project implementation are USD 39,640,800.In accordance with UNDP/GEF monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all regular projects supported by the GEF should undergo a mid-term review (MTR) and final evaluation (FE). MTR is an important activity, given the current context of WHyPGen project, to get an update of the project relevance, performance, early signs of potential impacts and sustainability of results, including contribution to the capacity development and achievement of global environmental goals. MTR will also identify and document lessons learnt and provide recommendations that might improve implementation of this project to achieve project objective, outcomes and outputs as stated in the WHyPGen log frame. ***The review team will comprise of an international and a local consultant.*** The objectives of the MTR are as follow:1. Promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. GEF results will be monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits;
2. Promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects and to improve knowledge and performance.
3. Identify problems that have been encountered as on date of the project implementation period, and provide recommendations of how to address these problems to ensure project is on track during rest of the project implementation period or as per adjusted schedule as applicable.

As defined in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy, an evaluation is a systematic and impartial assessment of an activity, project, program, strategy, policy, sector, focal area or other topics. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the involved partners. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes.  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK**
 |
| 1. **Scope of Review**

The scope of the MTR covers the entire UNDP/GEF-funded project and its components as well as the co-financed components of the project. The MTR will assess the Project implementation taking into account the status of the project activities and outputs and the resource disbursements made up to December 31, 2013.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 an effective relationship and communication between/among components so that data, information, lessons learned, best practices and outputs are shared efficiently, including cross-cutting issues?* How about achieving a total capacity of 9.4 MW WHyPGen demonstration projects implemented and operational by end of the project?
* How about achieving a total capacity of 100 MW of planned installation of WHyPGen at the end of the project?
* 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 review will include such aspects appropriateness and relevance with 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. **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)
* With regards to WHyPGen technology, is the existing technology provider in the country strengthened enough to support the project? Is the capacity building and skill enhancement of the technical personnel sufficient to support the project implementation?
* Are there issues with the WHyPGen adoption, operation and maintenance?
* So far, how effective is this project in helping or facilitating towards the following:
	+ introduction and promotion of WHyPGen investment
	+ establishment of financing mechanism for WHyPGen
	+ strengthening local capabilities in the design and implementation of WHyPGen techncology, specifically in terms of:
		- production of components locally in terms of part/module can be substituted from its origin supplier
		- what is the best way for the project to address this issue during rest of the project implementation period?
	+ development and approval of policies and regulatory frameworks that are supportive of WhyPGen applications in the country
* As part of wind hybrid power project financing, is there any issue with the financial support from banks, financial institutions, and private investments?
* How does overall implementation of the project activities contribute to the achievement of the targeted outputs and outcomes of WHyPGen?
* 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 as on date and need immediate attention immediately after MTR?
* A commentary is required on the “Expected Situation at the end of the Project” as envisioned at the MTR and recommendations, if any required, for accelerating the pace of work.

 1. *Factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results* (beyond the Project’s immediate control or project-design factors that influence outcomes and 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 well-placed and integrated within the national government development strategies, such as promotion of low carbon technologies, decentralized power generation using relatively clean energy resource such as natural gas resources etc., and related global development programs to which the project implementation should align?
* Does 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?
* Is the project logical framework and design still relevant in the light of project experience to date? If not, suggest an approach to propose changes from the project implementation perspective than propose changes to log frame in achieving the anticipated outputs.
* 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 implementation of demonstration projects, government or private sector or the captive power industry as a whole affecting the successful implementation and achievement of project results?
* Do the demonstration projects have secured sustainable fuel supply i.e. natural gas as anticipated in ProDoc? Has this issue been addressed well by the Project? If the availability of natural gas for these demonstrations is an issue, what are the plans for using alternative fuels and securing enough fuel for sustained operation of MCT demonstrations?
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?
* How about the changes made to project implementation arrangement during the project implementation, if applicable? Have they impacted the project in a positive way?
* How does the Project Management Unit (PMU) and BPPT work with its partners especially stakeholders in the country? If there were problems:
	+ identify those along with their causes
	+ how do those affect the performance of activities at the national level against the delivery of target outputs?
	+ what are the plans of the PMU in stimulating the interest and cooperation of its target partners?
	+ recommendations from the MTR Team of how to address those during rest of project implementation period.
* Is technical assistance and support received from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely?
* How is the committed co-financing for the project being used by PMU and BPPT? Report the co-financing details in the format as suggested in Annex 1 “Table A1: Financial Planning Co-financing”.
* What are the problems encountered in using or accessing the committed co-financing? If there were problems,
	+ how do those affect the delivery of the target outputs?
	+ what are the measure taken by BPPT and PMU to make use of the committed co-financing or leverage additional co-financing from the co-financers?
* Validate whether the risks originally identified in the project document and, currently in the APR/PIRs are reasonable? And their risk rating in terms of most critical is reasonable?
* Describe additional risks identified during the review, if any, and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
* What are the other barriers/problems being encountered?
	+ if possible, identify the causes for the same?
	+ how the PMU and BPPT have addressed those? If not addressed, explain why?
	+ recommendations from the MTR Team of how to address those during rest of the project implementation period.
* 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.
* How does the APR/PIR process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?
* How does the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system, operating as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making?
* Assess the use of electronic information and communication technologies in the implementation and management of the project.
1. *Strategic partnerships* (project positioning and leveraging)
* 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.
* 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. In summary, the MTR Team must include the following points in their final report.
* Conclusions on the findings, observations and results of MTR
* Lessons learnt and best practices that can be developed from these conclusions
* Recommendations based on the conclusions on how to improve the implementation of the WHyPGen activities during rest of the project implementation period
* Specific recommendations on how to expediently mobilize and facilitate the planned activities not completed as on date and activities to be completed during rest of the project implementation period.
1. **Review Methodology**

The international consultant will be the team leader and coordinate the consultancy to ensure quality of the report and timely submission. The local consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The MTR 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. The review team will conduct an opening meeting with the National Project Director (NPD), Deputy NPD-I, Deputy NPD-II, National Project Manager, Lead Consultant 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 MTR Team shall receive all the relevant documents including at least:* WHyPGen Project Document
* Inception Report
* Annual Work and Financial Plans
* Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) for 2012 and Quarterly Reports
* Minutes of project board meetings
* Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff and PMU staff (if any)

To provide more details, as may be needed, the following will be made available for access by the MTR 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 MTR Team should at least interview the following people, but not limited to:* National Project Director
* Deputy NPD-I, and Deputy NPD-II
* National Project Manager (NPM)
* Project Administrative Officer
* Project Financial Officer
* Board Members
* Relevant project stakeholders, and personnel of;
	+ DG-NREEC, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources
	+ BBTE - Balai Besar Teknologi Energi (Energy Technology Center)
	+ BPPT- Badan Pengkajian dan Penerapan Teknologi (Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology)
	+ PLN - Perusahaan Listrik Negara, state-owned electric company
	+ National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)
* Research institutions and Experts in the country, where applicable
* Relevant personnel at UNDP Country Office in Indonesia and in-charge of the WHyPGen Project
* Private sector entities that are potential developers and co-financers of WHyPGen project
* Other financial institutions such as IFC and donor agencies like USAID and DANIDA, where applicable
1. **Review Team**

The MTR Team will be composed of one International Lead Consultant and one National Consultant. With the aim of having an objective and independent project review, the MTR Team is expected to conduct the project review according to international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group. The individual experts in the Team needs to have good technical knowledge of the renewable energy (RE) and climate change projects and national context of RE project and program implementation in Indonesia, must be independent with no conflict of interest (i.e. not involved in the development or management of the project), possess good evaluation experience, and writing skills to carry out the assignment. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**
 |
| At the minimum, the International Consultant of the MTR Team shall have the following professional background and responsibilities:**International Lead Consultant****Profile*** Post-Graduate in Engineering, Management or Business
* Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized experience in renewable energy and climate change projects
* At least 3 years technical experience in power generation and/or engineering or operations.
* Technical experience in the application of wind power generation is advantageous
* 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 multidisciplinary 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 on RE and climate change projects
* Comprehensive knowledge of international RE industry best practices
* Very good report writing skills in English

**Responsibilities*** Documentation of the review
* Leading the MTR 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 WHyPGen Project Management
* Leading the drafting and finalization of the MTR 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**
 |
| **MTR 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 MTR described above, the review 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 MTR work plan, the consultant should provide Mid-Term Review 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 summary2. Introduction3. The project and its development context4. Findings and Conclusions4.1 Project formulation4.2 Implementation4.3 Results5. Completed tracking tool6. Conclusions on the findings, observations and results of MTR 7. Lessons learned8. Recommendations9. AnnexesMore 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 MTR work plan by WHyPGen and UNDP
 | **01 April 2014** | **30%** |
| 1. Upon acceptance of Final Mid-Term Review 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)