



TERMS OF REFERENCE

Outcome and Project Mid-term Evaluations UNDP Georgia Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development Portfolio

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In 2006, UNDP Georgia and the Government of Georgia signed the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). According to the document, energy and environment for sustainable development is one of the programmatic areas for UNDP Georgia in 2006-2010. All the intended outcomes and outputs under the CPAC energy and environment programme portfolio/component are aimed at contributing to the attainment of environmental sustainability, the broader outcome #5 of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

CPAP Energy and Environment component consists of two CPAP outcomes. The first relates to the sustainable management of environment and natural resources and the second - to the access to sustainable energy. More specifically, the sustainable energy outcome is intended to improve the access to sustainable energy through increased electricity production by using indigenous renewable energy resources, improving energy efficiency and ensuring sustainable development of Georgia's energy transit corridor. Expected outputs under the Sustainable Energy sub-component are: enhanced capacities of Georgian Government to monitor and ensure the compliance of the BTC pipeline to national and international requirements and standards; enhanced capacities of civil society organizations to conduct independent international-standard based monitoring and audit of BTC and; increased utilization of local renewable energy resources and improved energy efficiency.

To attain the first output, from 1997 through 2006 UNDP supported the Georgian International Oil Corporation (GIOG) in its capacity building. At present, UNDP continues capacity development of the Georgian Gas and Oil Corporation (GOGC), one of the successors of the GIOG. For the achievement of the second output, UNDP in partnership with BP/BTC and IFC supported Eurasia Foundation, an international NGO to enhance capacities of local NGOs in independent monitoring and audit of the BTC pipeline. In order to attain the third output, UNDP CO Georgia has been implementing 3 projects in the field of Renewable Energy. These projects are: "Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply" (project ID 00034741); "Promoting the Use of Small Hydro Resources at Community Level" (project ID 00048095); and "Promoting Clean Energy Technologies in Mountainous Regions of Georgia on the example of Oni Region" (project ID 00050786)

The full-sized UNDP/GEF RE project #00034741 is implemented since 2004. The Project consists of two components: financial and technical assistance (TA) components. UNDP/GEF supports the TA component of the project, an implementing partner for which is the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources of Georgia. The day-to-day management of the project is implemented by the Project Management Unit (PMU) consisting of a Project Manager, an International Consultant (company Posch & Partners) and administrative and technical assistants. The project aims at removing legal-regulatory, institutional and financial barriers to utilization of local renewable energies through supporting the creation of enabling legal-regulatory environment, establishing renewable energy revolving fund and credit line, implementing a number of demonstration projects for development of small hydropower and geothermal resources and, building capacities and raising awareness of local owners of renewable energies.

The project #00048095 is implemented since November 2006 under the financial support of the Government of Norway. The overall goal of the project is to promote the use of small hydropower resources in Georgia and build the capacity of local communities and SMEs in managing these resources, based on practices of sustainable natural resources management. This goal will be achieved through the implementation of the 3 pilot projects (rehabilitation of Khani-2 mini hydropower plant in Nergeeti, Baghdati district; construction of mini hydropower plant in Pshaveli, Telavi district and construction of Chiora HPP in Oni district). The implementing partner is the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources; responsible parties are Winrock International (NGO based in USA, contractor of USAID's "Rural Energy Program" in Georgia) for Khani-2 HPP and Pshaveli HPP and local company Group Racha Ltd for Chiora HPP. Project had to be finalized by 31 December, 2007. However, recently Winrock asked for the extension of the project by 2 months. The day-to-day management of the project is implementing by the same PMU, which is used for the project #00034741.

The objective of the project #00050786 is to increase the access of rural population of Georgia living in remote mountainous areas to local renewable energy resources. This objective is to be achieved through implementing pilot projects and developing RE Action Plan(s) for pilot region(s). The pilot projects include installation of solar thermal and biomass energy technologies (biogas) and high efficiency woodstoves.

Although, UNDP CPAP is to be finished in 2010, UNDP Georgia has decided to commission outcome evaluation of the Energy-related outcome of the CPAP in January-February 2008 in order to measure the relevance of the intended outcome, the progress towards its attainment and as well, its contribution to the broader UNDAF outcome. In addition, the outcome evaluation will study the underlying factors affecting the situation and recommend actions, if necessary to redirect UNDP's efforts in Energy field in order to make UNDP's programme more relevant, effective and efficient. One more reason, that predetermined Energy-related outcome evaluation until the end of the CPAP period, is the planned Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project "Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply", which consists of sizable portion (USD 4.3 million) of Energy and environment portfolio of UNDP Georgia. In order to maintain the integrity of the portfolio, ensure synergies among projects and achieve great efficiency, UNDP CO has decided to merge UNDP-GEF RE project Mid-term and energy outcome evaluations and conduct outcome evaluation with a greater emphasis on the evaluation of UNDP-GEF RE project.

2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the Energy outcome evaluation is to assess the progress towards the attainment of the selected outcome and UNDP's potential contributions in achieving that outcome. The assessment will consider the scope, relevance, efficiency, and sustainability of UNDP's support. Based on this assessment, the evaluation will make recommendations on how UNDP could improve the prospects of achieving the selected outcome through adjusting its programme, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods or management structures. For the UNDP GEF Renewable Energy project Mid-term Evaluation, detailed ToR is developed and annexed to this document.

In general, outcome evaluation is based on UNDP guidelines on outcome evaluation that call for an assessment of the results of UNDP's development cooperation activities in a particular thematic area. The proposed outcome evaluation of the sustainable energy thematic area will focus on:

- ◆ *outcome analysis* - what and how much progress has been made towards the achievement of the outcome (including contributing factors and constraints);
- ◆ *output analysis* - the relevance of and progress made in terms of the UNDP outputs (including analysis of both project and non-project activities);
- ◆ *output-outcome link* - what contribution UNDP has made/is making to the progress towards the achievement of the outcome;

The results of the outcome evaluation will be used for designing UNDP's interventions during the current UNDP CPAP period and designing the new programme for the next programming cycle.

More specifically, the scope of the outcome evaluation is as follows:

Outcome analysis

- Assess whether or not stated outcome, indicators and targets are appropriate for the development situation in Georgia and UNDP's program of assistance in this field
- Assess what is a current status and likelihood for achieving the outcome with indicated inputs and within the planned timeframe
- Assess what are the main factors (positive and negative) within and beyond UNDP's interventions that are affecting or that will affect the achievement of the outcome. How these factors limit or facilitate progress towards attainment of the outcome?
- Assess whether or not UNDP's proposed contributions to the achievement of the outcome are appropriate, sufficient, effective and sustainable
- Assess whether or not outcome indicators chosen are sufficient to measure the outcome
- Assess whether the outcome is guided by UNDP broad policy objectives on gender equity
- Examine the intended/unintended impacts for women and men
- Assess to what extent synergies in programming such as partnerships among various UNDP programmes relate to the outcome
- Assess cost-effectiveness of the programme and how economically programme inputs are converted into programme outputs.
- Assess the extent to which the capacity developed under the programme can continue to function without continued external support from UNDP

Output analysis

- What are the key outputs that have been or that will most likely be produced by UNDP to contribute to the outcome?
- Are the UNDP outputs relevant to the outcome?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link these outputs to the outcome, or is there is a need to improve these indicators?
- Is sufficient progress been made with regard to UNDP outputs?
- What are the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?
- Assess whether capacity development activities in support of sustainable development of Georgia's energy corridor have resulted in enhanced government and civil society capacities.
- Assess whether or not enabling environment was created/is being created for utilization of local renewable energies and improving energy efficiency.
- Assess whether or not UNDP's outputs/project are sustainable.

Resources, partnerships, and management analysis

- Is UNDP's resource mobilization strategy in sustainable energy appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving this outcome?
- Are UNDP's management structures and working methods appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving this outcome?
- Overall, assess the scope, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of UNDP's resources mobilization, partnership and management arrangements in achieving the intended outcome.
- The evaluation is expected to correlate gender outputs with the broader outcomes of UNDP.
- What are the key financial contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome?
- With the current planned interventions in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, will UNDP be able to achieve the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs – or whether additional resources are required and new or changed interventions are needed?

Recommendations

- Based on the above analysis, provide with practical recommendation how should UNDP adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the proposed outcome is fully achieved by the end of the CPAP period?
- Provide with practical recommendations on how to improve the quality of delivery of projects in the sustainable Energy area.

Other Areas to be evaluated

Besides putting primary focus on the above areas, evaluators will have to concentrate on the following throughout the outcome evaluation process. Outcome analysis will be focused on the five drivers of development effectiveness, as such the five drivers can be considered as cross-cutting issues that need to be emphasized in all outcomes.

- developing national capacities
- enhancing national ownership
- advocating and fostering an enabling policy environment
- promoting gender equality
- forging partnerships for results

These drivers of development effectiveness, when taken together, help to connect UNDP's substantive results to larger intended national development outcomes.

1. Developing national capacities

- How is the national dialogue on energy among key stakeholders supported that leads to broad consensus and agenda-setting?
- How is institutional capacity development at national and regional levels promoted for guaranteeing rights and providing services, including through strategy development, policy formulation and application, data collection, analyses and utilization, implementation, management (staff management, salaries, incentives), monitoring and learning?
- Has there been civic engagement of all sectors of society and empowerment of disadvantaged in planning and implementing programmes and policies, monitoring progress and learning from experiences?
- Have key skills (e.g. visioning, strategic planning, management, analysis, knowledge management) and domain-specific technical skills been enhanced?
- Have improvement of leadership skills at societal, institutional and individual levels been supported in order to drive integrated national and local development agenda?
- Have there been networking system established at a global, national and local levels?

2. Enhancing national ownership

- Do national and local governments take the lead in:
 - developing and implementing frameworks and strategies for sustainable energy;
 - mobilizing national and local resources to meet funding requirements for reaching the targets;
- Are the efforts made to encourage and reinforce the voice and role of the government and other national/local actors in claiming and assuming responsibility for a national development agenda, process and implementation?

3. Advocating and fostering an enabling policy environment

- Are energy dimensions mainstreamed into the key national development documents?
- What are the specific legal, policy and regulatory changes made through UNDP efforts?

4. Promoting gender equality

- How are gender issues integrated into energy frameworks and strategies?
- How is participation and representation in national and local arena promoted that influence policy decisions?

5. Forging partnerships for results

- Is there effective coordination and partnership established between UNDP, government and other energy and environment partners?
- Are the project stakeholders and local communities involved in planning and implementation of environmental and energy programmes?

- How partnerships were oriented to focus on agreed outcomes and using joint monitoring and review mechanisms?
- Is South-South cooperation promoted?

Projects to be evaluated:

Output 1:

- Capacity Building for the Georgian International Oil Corporation (finished);
- Capacity Building for the Georgian Gas and Oil Corporation

Output 2:

Pipeline Monitoring and Dialogue Initiative

Output 3:

- Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply (project ID 00034741);
- Promoting the Use of Small Hydro Resources at Community Level (project ID 00048095);
- Promoting Clean Energy Technologies in Mountainous Regions of Georgia on the example of Oni Region (project ID 00050786)

2. KEY DELIVERABLES/PRODUCTS

Following key deliverables/products are expected from this outcome and project Mid-term evaluations:

1. comprehensive Outcome Evaluation report that includes, but is not limited to:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods
- Key findings
- Conclusions and recommendations for the future program implementation

2. UNDP-GEF project: "Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply" Mid-term Evaluation report (scope and outline of the report is provided in the Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Project Mid-term Evaluation)

3. METHODOLOGY/EVALUATION APPROACH

An overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*.

UNDP-GEF project Mid-term evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the "GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy"

(see: <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>)

The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodologies for outcome and Mid-term evaluations during the preparatory phase of the evaluation. They should study above documents before coming with the concrete methodology for the outcome evaluation.

Evaluation tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- (i) desk review of existing documents and materials
- (ii) interviews with partners and stakeholders (including what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used)
- (iii) field visits to selected key projects (the purpose of the field visits is mainly to verify the UNDP produced outputs and the impact of the outputs)
- (iv) Participatory techniques and other approaches for data gathering and analysis

- (v) briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the government, as well as with other donors and partners. Of course, the evaluation team has certain flexibility to adapt the evaluation methodology to better suit the purpose of the evaluation exercise.

Each aspect/dimension will be rated as: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and N/A.

4. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will consist of three consultants: two international consultants – one to evaluate outputs and UNDP's interventions related to capacities for sustainable development of Georgia's energy corridor and another to evaluate outputs and UNDP's interventions related to renewable energies and energy efficiency, and a national consultant. The international consultant tasked to evaluate capacities for development of Georgia's energy corridor will also perform the Team Leader's role.

More specifically, following duties, responsibilities, skills and qualifications are expected from evaluation team

1. International Energy Expert/Outcome Evaluation Team Leader

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents and development of the outcome evaluation methodology, detailed work plan and report outline (4-day homework);
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on methodologies, scope and outlines of the reports (1 day);
- Interviews with key stakeholders (5 days);
- Field visits to project sites (4 days);
- Debriefing with UNDP (1 day);
- Development and submission of the aide memo and the first draft of the Outcome Evaluation report (5 days). The drafts will be shared with the UNDP CO and key project stakeholders for review and commenting. The 20th day of an assignment is a deadline for submission of the first draft(s);
- Finalization and submission of the final Outcome Evaluation Report (5 days);
- Supervision of the work of evaluation team (during entire evaluation period)

Skills and Qualifications:

- Master's of higher degree in energy, environmental and natural resource economics or other related fields;
- Experience in designing and evaluating projects aiming at capacity development of public institutions and CSO, especially in the energy field, including conventional energy (gas and oil) area;
- Experience in evaluating energy programmes and/or projects for UN or other international development agencies;
- Knowledge of UNDP outcome/project evaluation methodologies is an asset;
- Knowledge of the CIS region and particularly Georgia's context is an asset;
- Strong analytical skills;
- Excellent communications and writing skills;
- Fully e-literacy in terms of software and e-networking.
- Excellent coordination and team working skills;
- Fluency in English
- Knowledge of Russian or Georgian is an asset

Suggested Level:

Senior expert

Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The Outcome Evaluation Team Leader will be hired for 25 days under Special Service Agreement (SSA) with 10 days of home work and 15 days of mission to Georgia. He/she will be paid daily fee and DSAs according to UNDP salary scale for international experts and local DSA rate. DSA payments will be made based on actual days spent in Georgia. Fee payments will be made based on following milestones:

20% - First draft of Outcome evaluation report;
80% - Final Evaluation report

Duty Station:

UNDP Georgia while on mission

International Expert in Renewable Energies

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, contribution to the development of a draft methodology for outcome evaluation, specifically to the development of renewable energies part of it, detailed MTE work plan and outline (4-day homework);
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report (1 day);
- Interviews with executing agency(s), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (5 days);
- Field visits and interviews with owners of the small hydropower and geothermal projects (4 days);
- Debriefing with UNDP (1 day);
- Elaboration of the renewable energies and energy efficiency parts of the outcome evaluation report and submission to the Team Leader (2 days);
- Development and submission of the first MTE report draft (3 days). The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting. The 20th day of an assignment is a deadline for submission of the first MTE draft (s);
- Finalization and submission of the final MTE report (5 days)

Skills and Qualifications:

- Master's of higher degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields
- Experience in evaluating energy programmes for UN or other international development agencies is an asset
- Experience in RE in particular, small hydropower and geothermal resources project development and/or evaluation
- Knowledge of UNDP outcome evaluation methodologies is an asset
- Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to GEF RE and/or natural resource management projects
- Knowledge of the CIS region and particularly Georgia's context is an asset
- Strong analytical skills
- Excellent communications and writing skills
- Fully e-literacy in terms of software and e-networking
- Excellent team working skills
- Fluency in English
- Knowledge of Georgian or Russian is an asset

Suggested Level:

Senior expert

Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The consultant will be hired for 25 days under Special Service Agreement (SSA) with 10 days of home work and 15 days of mission to Georgia. He/she will be paid daily fee and DSAs according to UNDP salary scale for international experts and local DSA rate. DSA payments will be made based on actual days spent in Georgia. Fee payments will be made based on following milestones:

20% - First draft of Outcome evaluation report;
80% - Final Evaluation report

Duty Station:

UNDP Georgia while on mission

3. National Energy Expert

Duties and Responsibilities

- Collection of background materials upon request by the outcome evaluation team leader and renewable energy expert;
- Desk review of materials;
- Assistance to international experts in developing methodologies, work plans and report outlines;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to international experts in setting and conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders;
- Assistance to international experts in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to international experts in developing outcome evaluation and UNDP-GEF project MTE reports;

Skills and Qualifications:

- Master's degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields;
- 5 years of experience in energy project development. Experience in small hydropower and/or geothermal project development is an asset;
- Good understanding and knowledge of Georgia's context with regard to energy sector of Georgia, including renewable and conventional energies;
- Experience with UNDP/GEF renewable energy projects is a strong asset;
- Experience in energy program/project evaluation is an asset;
- Strong analytical skills;
- Strong oral, communications and writing skills;
- Fully e-literate in terms of software and e-networking.
- Excellent team working skills;
- Fluency in Georgian and English

Suggested Level:

NOC (equivalent to national professional, senior-level)

Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The national expert will be hired under Special Service Agreement (SSA). He/she will be paid lump sum based on UNDP Georgia local project staff salary scale. Payments will be made based on following milestones:

20% - First draft of the report;
80% - Final MTE report

Duty Station:

UNDP Georgia

5. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The energy outcome and project mid-term evaluations will be carried out by Outcome Evaluation Team. The logistical support and venue to the Evaluation team will be provided by the UNDP Georgia. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP-Georgia. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits (if necessary), coordinate with the Government and ensure the timely provision of DSAs and travel arrangements.

6. DOCUMENTS FOR STUDY BY THE EVALUATORS

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results;
2. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators;
3. UNDP Result-Based Management: Technical Note;
4. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>);
5. UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Georgia 2005-2009;
6. Country Program Document for Georgia 2006-2010;
7. Country Program Action Plan for Georgia 2006 – 2010;
8. Common Country Assessment
9. Millennium Development Goals Reports in Georgia;
10. UNDP ROARs for 2005-2006;
11. Georgia's strategic Directions in Energy;
12. Georgia's energy balance sheet;
13. Energy programmes/strategies and reports (source: Ministry of Energy, Georgian Gas and oil corporation);
14. Laws and regulations in energy sector, if available in English;
15. Sector assessment reports, if available
16. Project documents, progress and final reports:
 - o PMDI;
 - o GIOC Capacity Building;
 - o GOGC capacity building;
 - o UNDP-GEF RE project;
 - o Small Hydropower project;
 - o Clean Energy Technologies

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT MID-TERM EVALUATION



UNDP/GEF Project: # 00034741: Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply (PIMS 1277)

1. Introduction

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has two overarching objectives:

- a) 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; and
- b) 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.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective Project monitoring and evaluation. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators – or as specific time-bound exercise such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy” (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>).

Since 2004, UNDP Georgia has been implementing the UNDP/GEF full-sized project entitled “Georgia - Promoting the Use of Renewable Energy Resources for Local Energy Supply”. Project consists of two components: financial component and technical assistance (TA) component. UNDP/GEF is implementing TA component of the project, the implementing partner for which is the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Georgia. The day-to-day management of the project is implementing by the Project Management Unit (PMU) consisting of Project Manager, International Consultant (company Posch & Partners), administrative and technical assistants.

The duration of the project is 5 years (May 2004 – April 2009). The objective of the project is to remove the key barriers to the increased utilization of renewable energy (RE) for local energy supply. The initial focus is on promoting the use of geothermal resources for heating and hot water supply and the use of small hydro power for local electricity production. The project has four immediate objectives: (i) Creating a supportive institutional, legal and regulatory framework for the long term development of Georgia’s renewable energy resources; (ii) Raising public awareness on the possibilities for commercial development of the local renewable energy resources in Georgia and building the capacity of the local entrepreneurs to develop “bankable” investment proposals, to structure financing for the projects and to manage the development and the implementation of the projects otherwise; (iii) Gaining experience for and demonstrating the feasibility of financing renewable energy investments in Georgia, building the local capacity to manage these operations leveraging additional financing for the capitalization of the Fund or for the renewable energy investments otherwise; and (iv) Documenting and disseminating the results, experiences and lessons learned and promoting the replication of the project activities at the national as well as the regional level. These objectives are to be achieved among others through the implementation of the pilot projects (rehabilitation of the small hydropower plants and geothermal heat and hot water supply systems).

The project (its financial component) is co-financed by the Government of Germany through KfW, the financial resources of which are to be used for establishing the Renewable Energy Fund (REF), which will have the revolving nature. According to the project document (Prodoc), UNDP also had to contribute to the REF by USD 2.0 M.

For the time being the TA component of the project implemented by the UNDP, has prepared a draft of the National RE Strategy; finalized 14 pre-feasibility and 4 feasibility studies for small hydropower plants; finalized pre-feasibility study for Saburtalo geothermal project, Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and KfW has been concluded, according to which UNDP has to contribute USD 2 M to the REF if and when it has an endowment policy enabling it to jointly establish such a fund with KfW. Along with these achievements there is a significant delay in progress of the financial component conditioned mainly by delay in institutional arrangements related to the establishment of REF, which are expected to be finalized before the end of 2007. However, still there are no legal provisions for transfer of USD 2.0 M to KfW for establishment of REF. Thus, the project reached the phase, when the progress should be reviewed, the project approach analyzed and if found necessary modified, lessons learned captured, replication strategy developed and implemented.

2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is initiated and commissioned by UNDP Georgia country office. The objectives of the MTE is to evaluate the progress towards the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives and outcomes, capture lessons learned and suggest recommendations on major improvements. The Mid-term Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. To this end, the MTE will serve to:

1. Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
2. Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
3. Enhance organizational and development learning;
4. Enable informed decision-making;
5. Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

In addition, MTE has to identify/validate proposed changes to the Prodoc in order to ensure achieving all the objectives. MTE has also to assess whether it is possible to achieve the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

The evaluators will assess the project concept and design. The evaluator should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective and feasible alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. He/she will assess the relevance of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the evaluation is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between

different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

3. Detailed Scope of Work

The evaluator(s) will look at the following aspects:

3.1 Project Concept/Design, Relevance and strategy

3.1.1 Project relevance, country ownership/drivenness: the extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time as well as the extent the activities contribute towards attainment of global environmental benefits:

- a. Is the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country?
- b. Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans?
- c. How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results.
- d. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results.
- e. Do the outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? *Consider alternatives.*
- f. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation?
- g. Does the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government – or governments in the case of multicountry projects – approved policies or regulatory frameworks been in line with the project's objectives?

3.1.2 Preparation and readiness

- a. Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
- b. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
- c. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- d. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- e. Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

3.1.3 Stakeholder involvement

- a. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design?
- b. Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design of project activities?

3.1.4 Underlying Factors/assumptions

- a. Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.
- b. Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made
- c. Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project

3.1.5 Management arrangements

- a. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?

- b. Are the project roles in line with UNDP and GEF programme guides?
- c. Can the management arrangement model suggested by the project be considered as an optimum model? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations

3.1.6 Project budget and duration:

Assess if the project budget and duration were planned in a cost-effective way?

3.1.7 Design of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system

- a. Examine whether or not the project has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives.
- b. Examine whether or not the M&E plan includes a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities.
- c. Examine whether or not the time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs are specified.

3.1.7 Sustainability:

- a. Assess if project sustainability strategy was developed during the project design?
- b. Assess the relevance of project sustainability strategy

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Project's Adaptive Management

a. Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
 - Do they provide the necessary information?
 - Do they involve key partners?
 - Are they efficient?
 - Are additional tools required?
- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
- What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management, if such?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary¹. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise²
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tool for OP 6 and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.
- Assess whether or not M&E system facilitated timely tracking of progress towards project's objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; annual project reports are complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system is used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs

b. Risk Management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why.
- Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted
- Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
 - o Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System³ appropriately applied (with particular emphasis on the financial risks related to micro-grants)?

¹ See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

² See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

³ UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XI at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

- o How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project management?

c. Work Planning

- Assess the use of routinely updated workplans
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities
- Are work planning processes result-based⁴? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning.

d. Financial management

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. (Cost-effectiveness: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Also called cost-effectiveness or efficacy). Any irregularities must be noted.
- Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
- Did promised co-financing materialize? (Please fill the form on co-financing).

Cofinancing

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants										
Loans/Concessions (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.

e. Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

f. Delays

- Assess if there were delays in project implementation
- Assess if there were delays in project implementation then what were the reasons
- Did the delay affect the achievement of project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

3.2.2 Contribution of Implementing and Executing Agencies:

- Assess the role of UNDP and the project executing agency(s) against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
 - Field visits
 - Participation in Steering Committees
 - Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up

⁴ RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

- GEF guidance
- Skill mix
- Operational support
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide⁵, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework
- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP and the project executing agency(s) in terms of "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination)
- Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

3.2.3 Stakeholder Participation, Partnership Strategy

- a. Assess whether or not local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary.
- b. Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making.
- c. Does the project consult and make use of the 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?
- d. Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.
- e. Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships;

3.2.4 Sustainability: extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end. The evaluators may look at factors such as establishment of sustainable financial mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies or community production

3.2.5 Gender perspective: Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when applying project interventions.

- a. Explore how gender considerations are mainstreamed into project interventions. Suggest measures to strengthen the project's gender approach.

3.3 Project Results (Outputs, Outcomes and Impact)

3.3.1 Progress towards achievement of intended outcomes/measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for development of RE resources (legal and regulatory frameworks, access to financing, existence of the similar programs, existence of the RE strategy, etc.) to the baseline ones;

3.3.2 Changes in development conditions: Focus on capacity of the local entrepreneurs to develop "bankable" investment proposals, to structure financing for the projects and to manage the development and the implementation of the projects otherwise.

4. Evaluation Methodology

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following GEF evaluation criteria:

- (i) Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- (ii) Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.

⁵ The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>

- (iii) Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- (iv) Results/impacts – the positive and negative, 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.
- (v) Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated against individual criterion of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based on the following scale:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Unsatisfactory (U) The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for sustainability criteria the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

Financial resources:

- a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- b. 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)?

Socio-political:

- c. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
- d. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- e. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
- f. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

Institutional framework and governance:

- a. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
- b. While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.

Environmental:

- a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

- Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

In addition to project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, the evaluator should rate Project M&E system, including design of M&E systems and implementation of the Project M&E plan. More specifically, Project monitoring and evaluation systems should be rated as follows:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): There are no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory (S): There are minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodology and work plan for MTE during the preparatory phase of the MTE. The MTE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review;
- Interviews with major stakeholders, including UNDP/GEF project implementing partners, government representatives, NGOs, donors, owners of small hydropower and geothermal companies, etc.
- Field visits to the project sites (not sure that this is necessary);
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

An indicative outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report is presented below.

5. Deliverables

- Detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
- Mid-term evaluation report;
- Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement including recommendation for the revision of Prodoc, extension of the project;
- Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the renewable energy, for other countries in the region.

6. Indicative Outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive summary (1-2 pages)
 - Brief description of the project
 - Context and purpose of the evaluation
 - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Project background
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Key issues to be addressed
 - The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation

- Project and its development context (3-4 pages)
 - Project start and its duration
 - Implementation status
 - Problems that the project seek to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
 - An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;

- Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance) – (8-10 pages)
 - Project concept/design
 - Project relevance
 - Implementation approach
 - Country ownership/Driveness
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - Sustainability
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
 - Implementation
 - Financial management
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Management and coordination
 - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
 - Results
 - Attainment of outputs, outcomes and objectives
 - Project Impact
 - Prospects of sustainability

- Conclusions and recommendations (4 – 6 pages)
 - Findings
 - Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

- Lessons learned (3 – 5 pages)
 - Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

- Annexes: TOR, itinerary, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

The length of the mid-term evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

7. Management Arrangements

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) Team composed of one international expert and a national expert. The logistical support and venue to the MTE team will be provided by the UNDP Georgia. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP-Georgia. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits (if necessary), coordinate with the Government and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements.

8. Duration of the Mid-term Evaluation

It is expected to start MTE in the second half of January, 2008 and complete it within 25 days

9. Duties, Skills and Qualifications of Evaluation Team

International Expert in Renewable Energies

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, contribution to the development of a draft methodology for outcome evaluation, specifically to the development of renewable energies part of it, detailed MTE work plan and outline (4-day homework);
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report (1 day);
- Interviews with executing agency(s), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (5 days);
- Field visits and interviews with owners of the small hydropower and geothermal projects (4 days);
- Debriefing with UNDP (1 day);
- Elaboration of the renewable energies and energy efficiency parts of the outcome evaluation report and submission to the Team Leader (2 days);
- Development and submission of the first MTE report draft (3 days). The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting. The 20th day of an assignment is a deadline for submission of the first MTE draft (s);
- Finalization and submission of the final MTE report (5 days)

Skills and Qualifications:

- Master's of higher degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields
- Experience in evaluating energy programmes for UN or other international development agencies is an asset
- Experience in RE in particular, small hydropower and geothermal resources project development and/or evaluation
- Knowledge of UNDP outcome evaluation methodologies is an asset
- Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to GEF RE and/or natural resource management projects
- Knowledge of the CIS region and particularly Georgia's context is an asset
- Strong analytical skills
- Excellent communications and writing skills
- Fully e-literacy in terms of software and e-networking
- Excellent team working skills
- Fluency in English
- Knowledge of Georgian or Russian is an asset

Suggested Level:

Senior expert

Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The consultant will be hired for 25 days under Special Service Agreement (SSA) with 10 days of home work and 15 days of mission to Georgia. He/she will be paid daily fee and DSAs according to UNDP salary scale for international experts and local DSA rate. DSA payments will be made based actual days spent in Georgia. Fee payments the will be maid based on following milestones:

- 20% - First draft of Outcome evaluation report;
- 80% - Final Evaluation report

Duty Station:

UNDP Georgia while on mission

National Energy Expert

Duties and Responsibilities

- Collection of background materials upon request of the international expert, desk review of materials, assistance to the MTE Team Leader in developing methodology, work plan and outline of the MTE Team Leader;
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report;
- Assistance to the international expert in conducting interviews with project implementing partner, relevant Government, NGO, donor representatives;
- Field visit and assistance to the international consultant in arranging interviews with owners of the small hydropower and geothermal projects;
- Debriefing with UNDP;
- Assistance to the international consultant in developing the MTE report;

Skills and Qualifications:

- Master's degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields;
- 5 years of experience in RE project development. Experience in small hydropower and/or geothermal project development is an asset;;
- Good understanding and knowledge of Georgia's context with regard to RE sector of Georgia;
- Experience with UNDP/GEF renewable energy projects is a strong asset;
- Experience in RE project evaluation is an asset;
- Strong analytical skills;
- Strong oral, communications and writing skills;
- Fully e-literate in terms of software and e-networking.
- Excellent team working skills;
- Fluency in Georgian and English

Suggested Level:

NOC (equivalent to national professional, mid-level)

Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The national expert will be hired under Special Service Agreement (SSA). He/she will be paid lump sum based on UNDP Georgia local project staff salary scale. Payments will be made based on following milestones:

- 20% - First draft of MTE report;
- 80% - Final MTE report

Duty Station:

UNDP Georgia

10. List of Documents to be Reviewed

1. Project document and its annexes;
2. Annual work plans;
3. 2005, 2006, 2007 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) and latest progress reports;

4. Technical reports;
5. Georgian legislation and policy documents in the area of renewable energy;
6. Quarterly Operational reports;
7. Minutes of the Steering Committee meetings;
8. Project financial work plans and expenditure reports;
9. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
10. Financing Agreement and Separate Agreement between KfW and the Government of Georgia in the framework of the Program for the Promotion of Renewable Energy
11. Cooperation Agreement between the UNDP and KfW
12. Other upon request

11. Evaluation Policy

The evaluators should follow the major GEF principles for evaluation⁶:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethics
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

⁶ See p.16 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

ANNEX 2. TENTATIVE LIST OF MEETINGS TO BE HELD

Location	Meetings
UNDP CO	Meeting with UNDP Energy and Environment Team Leader
UNDP CO	Meeting with UNDP CO management
PMU, Ministry of Environment of Georgia	Meeting with UNDP RE Programme Manager, Paata Janelidze
Ministry of Environment of Georgia	Deputy Minister of Environment
Ministry of Environment	GEF operational focal point, Nino Tkhilava
GOGC	GOGC capacity building project management
GOGC	Commercial director
Eurasia Foundation	TBD
BTC	TBD
PMDI participating NGOs	TBD
Ministry of Energy	TBD
Winrock International	Horst Meinike, Chief of Party
USAID	Tamar Barabadze
KfW	Annica Calov and Nino Shanidze
Posch and Partners	Posch
EBRD GEEP	Vardigoreli
Oni project site	Project team
Ambrolauri	Oni governor's office representative
Oni	beneficiaries
SHPP owners	Onwers of 4 SHPPs
LTD Geothermia	Otar Vardigoreli, operator