



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Independent mid-term review of the UNIDO project:**

**Stimulating industrial competitiveness through biomass-based, grid-connected electricity generation.**

UNIDO SAP ID: 100288 and 100285 (PPG)  
GEF ID: 4747

**MARCH 2016**

## **CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>REVIEW APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>PROJECT REVIEW PARAMETERS</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>REPORTING</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>QUALITY ASSURANCE</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>Annex 1 - Outline of an independent mid-term review report</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>Annex 2 - GEF minimum requirements for M&amp;E</b>	<b>28</b>
	<b>Annex 3 – Checklist on independent mid-term review report quality</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Annex 4 – Required project identification and financial data</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Annex 5 – Job descriptions</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>Annex 6 – Project results framework</b>	<b>39</b>

## I. Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<b>Project Title</b>	Stimulating industrial competitiveness through biomass-based, grid-connected electricity generation
<b>UNIDO project No. and/or SAP ID</b>	100288
<b>GEF project ID</b>	4747
<b>Region</b>	LAC
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Dominican Republic
<b>GEF focal area(s) and operational programme</b>	CLIMATE CHANGE CCM-3
<b>GEF implementing agency(ies)</b>	UNIDO
<b>GEF executing partner(s)</b>	National Energy Commission (CNE), National Council for Free Trade Zones (CNZFE), Santiago Free Trade Zone Corporation (CZFIS)
<b>Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)</b>	FSP
<b>Project CEO endorsement / Approval date</b>	19 <sup>th</sup> December 2013
<b>Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> January 2014
<b>Expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> January 2018
<b>Revised expected implementation end date (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	
<b>GEF project grant (excluding PPG, in USD)</b>	1,300,000 (excl. project agency fee)
<b>GEF PPG (if applicable, in USD)</b>	60,000 (excl. project agency fee)
<b>UNIDO co-financing (in USD)</b>	60,000 (excl. PPG)
<b>Total co-financing at CEO endorsement (in USD)</b>	7,620,000
<b>Materialized co-financing at project completion (in USD)</b>	
<b>Total project cost (excluding PPG and agency support cost, in USD; i.e., GEF project grant + total co-financing at CEO endorsement)</b>	8,920,000
<b>Mid-term review date</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2016

(Source: Project document)

## 2. Project background and context

The energy sector in the Dominican Republic is characterized by a heavy reliance on imported fossil fuels and among the highest energy costs for industrial end-users in the region Latin America and the Caribbean<sup>1</sup>. Rising oil prices and the increase in energy demand quadrupled the cost of oil imports between 1997 and 2007<sup>2</sup>. Since the constitution of the National Energy Committee (CNE) in 2001<sup>3</sup>, progress is made towards diversifying the national energy mix with support from bilateral organizations, including the World Bank<sup>4</sup>. In August 2011, a new 345 kV transmission line was inaugurated connecting Santo Domingo with Santiago and the Cibao Valley. The same month, IADB approved loans for two wind farms with a total capacity of 77.2 MW. The energy sector overall has been further strengthened by the creation of the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM) in July 2013.

Investment in renewable energy technologies (RETs) is encouraged by Law 57-07 (2007), which establishes financial benefits and tax exemptions. In June 2011, the CNE approved regulation allowing net metering, which opens possibilities for small-scale generators. However, end-users still face frequent power outages and high energy costs. The technical and commercial losses in the distribution system are well above the average for Latin America<sup>5</sup>. With virtually no exception, industries and large businesses have diesel generators installed for backup power supply. The country's Industrial Free Zones<sup>6</sup> are greatly affected by the inadequate energy service and high costs and become less competitive. Globalization and free trade agreements worldwide have put further pressure on this development model, especially in the apparel industry. Therefore, diversification of economic activities, cost reduction and the efficient use of resources are key elements in a strategy to modernize the sector.

The overall objective of the project is to promote the implementation of decentralized, biomass-based energy production in industrial free zones in the Dominican Republic with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to their competitiveness.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2011, electricity prices in the Dominican Republic for commercial users were US\$ 0.62/kWh with the average in the region being US\$ 0.21/kWh. Similarly prices for industrial users were significantly higher; US\$ 0.45/kWh in DR and US\$ 0.17/kWh on average in the region. Prices for residential consumers were also significantly higher than in the region on average (US\$ 0.40/kWh as compared to US\$ 0.19/kWh). Source: OLADE. Energy Economic Information System. Energy Statistics, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> From roughly US\$ 814 mln to US\$ 3,267 mln. See: Carlos Cuello, "Puntos de vista - El petróleo amenaza la estabilidad macroeconómica," listindiario.com, July 22, 2008. (<http://www.listin.com.do/app/article.aspx?id=66921>).

<sup>3</sup> Created under the Electricity Law (Ley General de Electricidad) No.125-01, July 26, 2001 and its revision Law No.186-07.

<sup>4</sup> Power Sector Technical Assistance Project 2004-2010 (Project ID: P082715); Dominican Republic Power Sector Program - Second Generation Reforms 2005-2009 (Project ID: P082712).

<sup>5</sup> Estimations of commercial losses vary between 30-50%, even though the residential users below 700 kWh/month pay a subsidized tariff. Since 2007, fraud is considered a crime. See: <http://www.sie.gov.do/archivos/fraude.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> The "industrial free zone" business model offers important tax benefits for manufacturing companies to establish themselves in the country. It has been a spearhead in national development strategies since the 1970s, offering low-skilled jobs to large numbers of people.

In line with the National Energy Plan, CNE has entered into an agreement with CNZFE (the supervising body for the free zone sector) to address the critical energy situation in the industrial free zones (IZFs). The conservation of employment is a top priority at the highest political level, and a more effective use of energy will contribute to maintain competitiveness. Decentralized electricity and heat generation based on renewable energy sources are thereby recognized as valuable options to reduce energy costs and improve reliability of the electricity supply. The baseline project aims at exploring the opportunities to secure electricity supply and reduce energy costs for IFZs by investing in small power plants for electricity production, possibly combined with heat generation. The available options being considered are systems based on fuel oil, natural gas, or biomass. The baseline project primarily intended to replace the existing, individual diesel back-up systems by an efficient, small power plant. The diesel back-up systems have high operating costs and are polluting but are operated only during a limited time per year. Their main function is to maintain electricity supply in case of a grid power blackout and reduce the risk on commercial losses and possible damage to equipment for the industry. Continuous operation of these diesel systems is prohibitive because of the fuel costs. Recent developments in the electricity wholesale market have exacerbated the urgency for the free zones in the country to address the energy situation. In the light of rising electricity demand and generating capacity falling behind, several contracts between large consumers and private generators were terminated as preference is given to the public distribution companies. New contracts may be signed but at a higher price level, expectedly up to 50%. Therefore, the baseline project has slightly changed and the focus is now on an efficient, decentralized power plant that can supply electric energy at a cost level comparable to the cost of grid electricity. Such a plant may also be operated continually, with grid electricity covering peak power loads as well as function as backup.

Therefore, the Project will strengthen the resilience of the national economy by providing renewable, biomass-based electricity at a competitive cost level, thereby controlling one of the two main cost drivers for the manufacturing companies established at industrial free zones in the Dominican Republic. The Project is aimed at demonstrating and promoting the viability and benefits of decentralized electricity generation in the country, both for self-supply and for sales of surplus electricity to the national grid. The application of co-generation schemes will depend on the individual composition of electricity vs. heat demand and may not always be feasible. Notwithstanding, the Project envisages to make optimum use of available, domestic biomass resources whenever possible. Decentralized, biomass based electricity is expected to deliver electric energy for industrial users at a cost level 15-40% lower than prices on the deregulated market (which is due to imperfections in the national electricity market), simultaneously providing backup power to protect industrial areas from eventual blackouts. The price difference will directly translate into reduced operating costs, hence improving the operational result of an enterprise, especially for energy-intensive industries and sectors with narrow profit margins.

The access to secure and economical electric energy is a major asset for the industrial free zones in the country to maintain industries in the country. Improving the industrial performance is instrumental for preserving employment, with great social impact at the national and provincial level. From a national perspective, the high energy costs make Dominican Republic less attractive for foreign companies. Already established companies, of which many are (at least partially) owned by Dominican capital, face trouble to compete and may close down. Job conservation is therefore one of the

Government's key priorities. This particularly holds for the Santiago area, which depends heavily on the economic activity in its free zones.

It is expected that biomass-based energy generation will be adopted by industrial free zones and other large consumers in the country. In 2011, 51 free zones were operating in the Dominican Republic concentrating a total of 578 companies and employing more than 125,000 workers; thus constituting a significant potential for replication. With this in mind, it should be noted though that the extraction of biomass resources from agricultural and forest areas may be critically observed by civil society, including environmental protection groups. The construction of small-scale biomass-based power plants nearby densely populated areas may also cause resistance. These concerns are planned to be addressed via a transparent and active communication plan and engagement.

With regards to gender, it is expected that social and economic benefits from biomass-based electricity supply will be shared equally by male and female workers in the industrial free zones. In the case of Santiago employment per gender is roughly 50%-50% but in other industrial zones, the situation may be different. Direct creation of jobs such as plant operator, truck driver, harvesting and biomass collection and processing (cutting and compacting) will likely favor men more than women, considering that this type of work is typically done by male workers. However, women often have a predominant role to sustain smallholder economies. Hence gender aspects will be paid particular attention to with respect to the biomass sourcing strategies. Similarly, communication and training activities will be reviewed to assure that they specifically address the needs of women.

Project implementation started in January 2014 and the foreseen project end date is January 2018.

Regular Monitoring is foreseen in the project document, as well as an independent mid-term review (MTR) and a terminal review (TE). The independent MTR will be carried out by two national evaluators from March 2016 – May 2016, and include technical field visits and meetings foreseen for April 2016. The TE is scheduled to take place at the beginning of 2018.

### **3. Project objective and structure**

The overall objective of the project is to promote the implementation of decentralized, biomass-based energy production in industrial free zones in the Dominican Republic with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to their competitiveness.

The project consists of 4 technical components, in addition to project management, as follows:

Project component 1 (PC-1): Policy support for decentralized, biomass-based electricity generation. This project component is aimed at strengthening the existing regulatory framework for small-scale, decentralized power plants. While high-level policy generally allows decentralized power generation, there are no specific incentives to promote small-scale generation as part of the national power system. Project developers such as the CZFIS therefore prefer to operate under the self-

supply modality, which leaves the potential of small power plants selling to the grid, untapped. Regulation and permitting procedures are designed for large power plants, and may likely be simplified for small-scale power systems. GEF support will thus assist in fine-tuning existing regulation and incentives to make investment in energy generation attractive for these market players. Additional regulation may prove beneficial to address specific concerns about biomass plants, such as nuisance and particle emissions.

Project component 2 (PC-2): Demonstration of proven biomass technology for electricity generation. This project component envisages creating a successful showcase of the application of biomass technology for electricity generation at an industrial free zone in the Dominican Republic. This demonstration plant will cover the base load of the Santiago Industrial Free Zone and operate under the self-supply modality. The project development and realization process is expected to generate a wealth of experiences regarding the appropriateness of existing regulation and permitting, environmental issues, biomass logistics, cost-effectiveness and interaction with civil society, as well as useful lessons for replication. It is anticipated that the traffic-light approach developed under the global GEF project 'Establishing Sustainable Liquid Biofuels Production Worldwide (A Targeted Research project)' (ID# 3224) will also be tested.

Project component 3 (PC-3): Supportive activities for training, promotion and dissemination. The objective of this project component is to address barriers related to information and business skills that may affect market development of biomass power generation in the Dominican Republic, as well as the implementation of the envisaged pilot project. Considering that the acute energy situation in the Dominican Republic also affects the other free zones in the country, it is anticipated that, if proven successful, the model for decentralized power generation for self-supply on the basis of biomass will have great potential for replication. Especially the environmentally and socially sensitive approach towards securing biomass supply that the project promotes should facilitate wide-spread uptake. All outputs under this component will pay particular attention to gender aspects to assure that both men and women will benefit equally.

Project component 4 (PC-4): Monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring of project progress is essential for the adequate and timely delivery of results. This project component covers project monitoring and oversight by UNIDO in close coordination with CNE and the project partners in Santiago, as well as mid-term review and terminal evaluation of the Project.

The following are, in brief, some of the expected results of the project:

- The policy and regulatory environment conducive to decentralized, biomass-based power and heat generation has been strengthened.
- A biomass-based electric power plant (envisaged capacity 3 MW<sup>7</sup>) has been adopted by the Santiago Industrial Free Zone.
- Awareness for the concept and benefits of biomass power generation has been raised among relevant stakeholders.

---

<sup>7</sup> Please note that final capacity may lie slightly below 3 MW.

- A monitoring plan has been prepared and implemented in coordination with UNIDO.

#### 4. Project implementation and execution arrangements

**UNIDO:** Implementing agency. Oversees the implementation of the project and is represented by a designated UNIDO staff member (PM Vienna) in the Steering Committee. Moreover, UNIDO is responsible for contracting part of the members of the Project Management Unit (PMU).

**Comisión Nacional de Energía (CNE):** Executing partner. Apart from being part of the Steering Committee (SC), the CNE executes some of the project activities. It will designate a person to act as the National Project Director (NPD) and who will be responsible for assuring that the project is represented on the national level and that all communications are channeled correctly between the relevant (governmental) actors. Furthermore, CNE hosts the Project Management Unit (PMU) and is responsible for contracting /seconding part of its members – both as part of its co-financing commitments. A legal agreement has been signed with CNE and UNIDO covering the project.

**Consejo Nacional de Zonas Francas de Exportación (CNZFE):** Executing partner, which will coordinate project activities along with CNE and CZFIS. It will be represented by a person in the Steering Committee. CNZFE will provide in-kind support in the form of technical input, human resources and networking facilities related to undertakings within the scope of this project. There is no separate legal agreement signed between CNZFE and UNIDO; however, a project-related agreement between CNE and CNZFE exists.

**Corporación de la Zona Franca Industrial de Santiago (CZFIS):** Executing partner, which will coordinate project activities along with CNE and CNZFE. It will be represented by a person in the Steering Committee. CZFIS will be responsible for the power plant and assume the investment costs. Moreover, CZFIS will provide in-kind support in the form of technical input, human resources and meeting facilities related to undertakings within the scope of this project. There is no separate legal agreement signed between CZFIS and UNIDO.

**Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales:** Hosts the GEF Operational Focal Point and as such is a member of the Steering Committee. The Ministry provides support in the form of technical inputs and human resources related to undertakings within the scope of this project, not only in terms of GEF related matters but also all matters pertaining to the use of biomass resources.

**Ministerio de Energía y Minas (MEM):** Created in July 2013, MEM is responsible for the formulation, adoption, monitoring, evaluation and monitoring of policies, strategies, master plans, programs, projects and services related to the energy sector and its subsectors energy power, renewable energy, nuclear energy, natural gas and mining<sup>8</sup>. The MEM was invited to join the Steering Committee after project start and supports project related undertakings in the form of technical inputs and human resources.

---

<sup>8</sup> CNE is a decentralized organ under the auspices of MEM

## **5. Relevant project reports/documents**

### PIRs

4747\_2015\_PIR\_UNIDO\_Dom Rep\_Zetsche, 2015

### PSC meeting minutes

Minuta de Reunión del Comité Directivo del Proyecto (CDP), July 2014

MINUTA REUNIÓN DEL COMITÉ DIRECTIVO DE PROYECTO (CDP), January 2015

MINUTA REUNIÓN DEL COMITÉ DIRECTIVO DE PROYECTO (CDP), August 2015

MINUTA REUNIÓN DEL COMITÉ DIRECTIVO DE PROYECTO (CDP), September 2015

MINUTA REUNIÓN DEL COMITÉ DIRECTIVO DE PROYECTO (CDP), November 2015

### Monitoring reports

2014.11 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2014.12 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.01 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.02 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.03 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.04 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.05 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.06 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.07 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.08 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.09 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.10 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.11 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015.12 - Sistema de Metas Presidenciales

2015 11 15 - Reporte CDP - Tercer Trimestre 2015\_rev

Monitoring report 2016\_01

Monitoring report 2016\_02

### Studies

Biomass: Informe Final ONUDI 2015

Pre-feasibility: ESTUDIO DE PREFACTIBILIDAD-INFORMEv2 with attachments

## **6. Budget information**

As envisioned at the time of CEO endorsement/approval, the project is funded through a GEF grant, amounting to USD 1,300,000 (and PPG Grant of USD 60,000), a UNIDO co-financing contribution of USD 60,000 in cash (excluding the PPG phase); and other co-financing of USD 7,560,000, which amount to total project budget of USD 8,920,000.

Financing plan summary for the project (in USD):

Type of financing	Project preparation (in USD)	Project (in USD)	Total (in USD)
GEF financing	60,000	1,300,000	1,360,000
Co-financing:	60,000	7,620,000	7,680,000
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>120,000</b>	<b>8,920,000</b>	<b>9,040,000</b>

(Source: CEO endorsement document)

Project budget:

Project components	Project outcomes	GEF grant amount (excl. PPG) (in USD)	Co-financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
1. Policy support for decentralized, biomass-based electricity generation	1. The policy and regulatory environment conducive to decentralized, biomass-based power and heat generation has been strengthened.	287,000	437,000	<b>724,000</b>
2. Demonstration of proven biomass technology for electricity generation	2. A biomass-based electric power plant (envisaged capacity 3 MW) has been adopted by the Santiago Industrial Free Zone.	735,000	6,685,000	<b>7,420,000</b>
3. Supportive activities for training, promotion and dissemination	3. Awareness for the concept and benefits of biomass power generation has been raised among	113,000	120,000	<b>233,000</b>

	relevant stakeholders.			
M&E	M&E	50,000	80,000	<b>130,000</b>
Project management	Project management	115,000	298,000	<b>413,000</b>
<b>Total (in USD)</b>		<b>1,300,000</b>	<b>7,620,000</b>	<b>8,920,000</b>

(Source: CEO endorsement document)

Expected co-financing source breakdown is as follows:

<b>Name of co-financier (source)</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Total amount (in USD)</b>
<b>UNIDO</b>	Implementing agency	Cash/grant	60,000
<b>CNE</b>	National Government	In-kind	475,000
<b>CNZFE</b>	National Government	In-kind	400,000
<b>CZFIS</b>	Others	Cash/grant	2,100,000
<b>CZFIS</b>	Others	Hard Loan	4,375,000
<b>CZFIS</b>	Others	In-kind	210,000
<b>Total co-financing (in USD)</b>			<b>7,620,000</b>

(Source: CEO endorsement document)

**UNIDO GEF-grant disbursement breakdown:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Disbursement (commitment + expenditure) in 2012</b>	<b>Disbursement in 2013</b>	<b>Disbursement in 2014</b>	<b>Disbursement in 2015</b>	<b>Disbursement in 2016</b>	<b>Total disbursement (in USD) (2012-present) (27 January 2016)</b>
Sub-contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	USD 44,809.46	0.00	USD 44,809.46
Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	USD 689.66	USD 689.66
International Experts	USD 14,578.59	USD 2,996.19 EUR 2,879.06	USD 6,669.33	USD 4,000.00	USD 11,382.86	USD 39,626.97 EUR 2,879.06
International Meetings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Project travel	USD 3,585.79	USD 231.16	USD 2,005.01	USD 3,730.69	0.00	USD 9,552.65
National Experts	USD 27,817.71	0.00	USD 22,207.85	USD 27,225.51	USD 29,697.13	USD 106,948.20
Other direct costs	EUR 1,595.02	EUR 3,582.82	USD 5,007.15 EUR 3,797.68	USD 1,164.28	0.00	USD 6,171.43 EUR 8,975.52
Staff travel	EUR 5,549.10	EUR -49.00	EUR 10,627.62	EUR 13,737.50	0.00	EUR 29,865.22
Training/ Fellowship/ Study Tour	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	USD 45,982.09 EUR 7,144.12	USD 3,227.35 EUR 6,412.88	USD 35,889.34 EUR 14,425.30	USD 80,929.94 EUR 13,737.50	USD 41,769.65	USD 207,798.37 EUR 41,719.80

Source: SAP database, 8 February 2016 (includes GEF and UNIDO funding, PPG & project)

## **II. Scope and purpose of the mid-term review**

The independent mid-term review will cover the duration of the project from its starting date in January 2014 to the estimated mid-term review date in April 2016. It will assess project performance and progress against the review criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The nature of the mid-term review is largely a management tool to provide the project team and stakeholders with an account of results achieved at the time of reporting, and to guide for the remaining period of the project.

The review team should provide an analysis of the attainment of the main objective and specific objectives under the four core project components. Through its assessments, the review team should enable the Government, counterparts, the GEF, UNIDO and other stakeholders and donors to:

- (a) Verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project review parameters defined in chapter VI.
- (b) Enhance project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability by proposing a set of recommendations with a view to ongoing and future activities until the end of project implementation.

**The key question of the mid-term review is to what extent the project is achieving the expected results at the time of the mid-term review, i.e. to what extent the project has achieved its main objective of promoting the implementation of decentralized, biomass-based energy production in industrial free zones in the Dominican Republic with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to the development of a low carbon sustainable production model supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.**

## **III. Review approach and methodology**

The mid-term review will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects, the GEF's 2008 Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy from 2010 and the Recommended Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies.

It will be carried out as an independent mid-term review using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the review. The review team leader will liaise with the project manager on the conduct of the review and methodological issues.

The review team will be required to use different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the mid-term review to assess causality through

quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The review team will develop interview guidelines. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and GEF annual project implementation review (PIR) reports), output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).
  - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. The review team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the different types of intervention (enabling, capacity, investment, demonstration). The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders.
3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available the review team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.
4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
5. Interviews with project partners including Government counterparts, GEF focal points and partners that have been selected for co-financing as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.
6. On-site observation of results achieved in demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.
7. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project. The evaluator shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agencies or other organizations.
8. Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office and the project's management and Project Steering Committee (PSC) members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary. If deemed necessary, the evaluator shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluator and/or UNIDO, ODG/EVA.
10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the review team and include a review matrix.

## **IV. Review team composition**

The review team will be composed of two national evaluation consultants.

The review team should be able to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including review verification on request to the GEF partnership up to two years after completion of the independent mid-term review.

Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions attached to these terms of reference.

Members of the review team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the programme/projects.

The project manager at UNIDO and CNE, CNZFE and CZFIS will support the review team. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator will be briefed on the mid-term review and equally provide support to its conduct. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator will be briefed on the mid-term review.

## **V. Time schedule and deliverables**

The mid-term review is scheduled to take place in the period from 29 March 2016 to 27 May 2016. The technical field visits and meetings are planned for 7 to 15 April 2016. At the end of the technical field visits and meetings, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in the Dominican Republic.

At the end of the evaluation field visits and meetings, a debriefing should be conducted inviting local stakeholders (incl. government and parties involved in the evaluation). After the field visits and meetings, it will be assessed whether the review team leader will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of preliminary findings of the mid-term review or whether this can be conducted via Skype. The draft mid-term review report will be submitted 4-6 weeks after the end of the field visits and meetings. The draft mid-term review report is to be shared with the UNIDO PM, ODG/EVA, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and the GEF OFP and other relevant stakeholders for receipt of comments. The ET leader is expected to revise the draft mid-term review report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the mid-term review report in accordance with UNIDO, ODG/EVA standards.

## **VI. Project review parameters**

### **A. Project design**

The review will examine the extent to which:

- ✓ The project's design is adequate to address the problems at hand;
- ✓ A participatory project identification process was instrumental in selecting problem areas and national counterparts;
- ✓ The project has a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators;

- ✓ The project was formulated based on the logical framework (project results framework) approach;
- ✓ The project was formulated with the participation of national counterparts, stakeholders and/or target beneficiaries through a participatory and broad public consultation approach;
- ✓ Relevant country representatives (from government, industries, gender groups, and civil society), including the GEF OFP, have been appropriately involved and were participating in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies;
- ✓ All GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects have incorporated relevant environmental and social risk considerations into the project design / all GEF-6 projects are following the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP) tracking the relevant environmental and social (E&S) risks and applying appropriate E&S safeguards, established at the time of project design;
- ✓ All GEF-6 projects have incorporated relevant knowledge management strategy, including plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share the knowledge, experiences and expertise generated by the project with the relevant stakeholders, UNIDO HQ, the GEF Sec and the broader GEF Network (i.e., GEF Agencies and other stakeholders);
- ✓ The project preparation/formulation process is timely and efficient, and which are the reasons in case of delays/issues (e.g., compliance with the 18 month CEO endorsement deadline; adequacy of communication among stakeholders).

## **B. Project relevance**

The review will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

- ✓ National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and the population, and regional and international agreements. See possible review questions under Country ownership/drivenness below.
- ✓ Target groups: relevance of the project's objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g., companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training).
- ✓ GEF's focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the GEF focal area(s)/operational program strategies? Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of GEF's Climate Change Focal area, specifically CCM-1 and CCM-3.
- ✓ UNIDO's thematic priorities: Were they in line with UNIDO's mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme & Budget and core competencies?
- ✓ Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment? Was there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?

## **C. Effectiveness: objectives and planned final results at the end of the project**

- The mid-term review will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes, have been achieved. In detail, the following issues will be assessed: To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? Has the project

generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?

- Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from the project.
- How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Identify actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below “monitoring of long term changes”). Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.
- Describe any catalytic or replication effects: the mid-term review will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the mid-term review will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project’s catalytic role.

#### **D. Efficiency**

The extent to which:

- The project cost was effective? Was the project using the least cost options?
- Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Are the project’s activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?
- Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
- Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors’ projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?

#### **E. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes**

Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. Assessment of sustainability of outcomes will be given special attention but also technical, financial and organization sustainability will be reviewed. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. It will include both

exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

- ✓ **Financial risks.** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.) Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing? To what extent are energy costs and prices likely to be competitive to sustain the operations of the companies in the free zone after the project ends?
- ✓ **Sociopolitical risks.** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? 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? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- ✓ **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- ✓ **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? The mid-term review should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

#### F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems

- **M&E design.** Did the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The mid-term review will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the project M&E plan (see [annex 2](#)).
- **M&E plan implementation.** The mid-term review should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Where monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts? Are there any annual work plans? Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance reviews take place regularly?

- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was adequately funded and in a timely manner during implementation.

## **G. Monitoring of long-term changes**

The monitoring and evaluation of long-term changes is often incorporated in GEF-supported projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the mid-term review report will describe project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

- a. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- b. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?
- c. Is the system sustainable—that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?
- d. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?

## **H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results**

Among other factors, when relevant, the mid-term review will consider a number of issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The assessment of these issues can be integrated into the analyses of project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and management as the evaluators find them fit (it is not necessary, however it is possible to have a separate chapter on these aspects in the mid-term review report). The mid-term review will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and achievement of project results:

- a. **Preparation and readiness / Quality at entry.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- b. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country — or of participating countries, in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Was the GEF OFP involved in the project design and

implementation? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects — approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?

- c. **Stakeholder involvement and consultation.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through continuous information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes involved in a participatory and consultative manner? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (i.e., NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies, etc.) and what were their immediate tasks? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and review of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions?
- d. **Financial planning.** Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? Specifically, the mid-term review should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.
- e. **UNIDO's supervision and backstopping.** Did UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Did UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?
- f. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** Did the project manage to mobilize the co-financing amount expected at the time of CEO Endorsement? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually mobilized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- g. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- h. **Implementation and execution approach.** Is the implementation and execution approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Is the implementation and execution approach in line with the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01) and the relevant UNIDO Regulations (DGAI.20 and

Procurement Manual)? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks? In cases where Execution was done by third parties, i.e. Executing Partners, based on a contractual arrangement with UNIDO was this done in accordance with the contractual arrangement concluded with UNIDO in an effective and efficient manner?

- i. **Environmental and Social Safeguards.** If a GEF-4 or GEF-5 project, has the project incorporated relevant environmental and social risk considerations into the project design? What impact did these risks have on the achievement of project results? If a GEF-6 project, have the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP) tracking the relevant environmental and social (E&S) risks and applying appropriate E&S safeguards, established at the time of project design been followed? Have the identified E&S risks been appropriately mitigated?
- j. **Knowledge Management.** If a GEF-6 project, has the project incorporated a relevant knowledge management strategy, including plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share the knowledge, experiences and expertise generated by this project with the relevant stakeholders, UNIDO HQ, the GEF Sec and the broader GEF Network (i.e. GEF Agencies and other stakeholders)?

As per the GEF's requirements, the report should also provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the format in annex 3, which is modeled after the GEF's project identification form (PIF).

## I. Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g., providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)?
- The UNIDO HQ and Field Office based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g., problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?
- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms were efficient and effective? Did each partner have specific roles and responsibilities from the beginning till the end? Did each partner fulfill its role and responsibilities (e.g., providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)? Were the UNIDO HQ based management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs efficient, timely and effective (e.g., problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?

## **J. Assessment of gender mainstreaming**

The mid-term review will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected gender mainstreaming in the project:

- Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, how?
- Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)?
- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- Have women and men benefited equally from the project's interventions? So far, do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)?
- To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

## **VII. Reporting**

### **Inception report**

These terms of reference provide some information on the review methodology but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the team leader will prepare, in collaboration with the other national evaluation consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the TOR relating to the review questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of review methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through a review framework ("review matrix"); division of work between the two national evaluation consultants; technical site visits and meetings plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable<sup>9</sup>.

### **Mid-term review report format and review procedures**

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO, ODG/EVA (the suggested report outline is in [annex 1](#)) and circulated to UNIDO staff, the GEF OFP and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to the project manager for collation and onward transmission to the project review team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the review team will prepare the final version of the mid-term review report.

---

<sup>9</sup> The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an inception report (prepared by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation).

The review team will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feed-back in preparing the mid-term review report. A presentation of preliminary findings will also take place for members at HQ (either in person or via Skype) after the technical site visits and meetings.

The mid-term review report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the mid-term review, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the mid-term review took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The mid-term review report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 1.

### **Mid-term review: Work plan**

The **mid-term review work plan** includes the following main products:

1. Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology: Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the Methodology, the desk review could be completed.
2. Inception report: At the time for departure to the field visits and meetings, the complete gamete of received materials have been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.
3. Field visits and meetings: The principal responsibility for managing this mid-term review lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and meetings, coordinate with the Government. At the end of the field visits and meetings, there will be a presentation of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.
4. Preliminary findings from the field visits and meetings: Following the field visits and meetings, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared and presented in the field and for UNIDO Headquarters personnel.
5. A draft Mid-term review report will be forwarded electronically to the Project Manager, who will forward the same to the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and circulated to main stakeholders.
6. A final mid-term review report will incorporate comments received.

## **VIII. Quality assurance**

The project manager (PM) will be responsible for managing the mid-term review, preparing the terms of reference (TOR) and the job description (JD) of the review consultant(s) on the basis of guidance of the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA). The PM will forward drafts and final reports to ODG/EVA for review, distribute drafts and final reports to stakeholders (upon review by ODG/EVA), and organize presentations of preliminary review findings which serve to generate feedback on and discussion of mid-term review findings and recommendations at UNIDO HQ. Finally, the PM will be responsible for the submission of the final mid-term review report.

## **Annex 1 - Outline of an independent mid-term review report**

### **Executive summary**

- Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main review findings and recommendations
- Must present strengths and weaknesses of the project
- Must be self-explanatory and should be 3-4 pages in length

### **I. Mid-term review objectives, methodology and process**

- Information on the mid-term review: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the mid-term review, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

### **II. Countries and project background**

- Brief countries context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project<sup>10</sup> and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

### **III. Project assessment**

This is the key chapter of the report and should address all review criteria and questions outlined in the TOR (see section VI - Project review parameters). Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

- A. Design
- B. Relevance (report on the relevance of the project towards countries and beneficiaries)
- C. Effectiveness (the extent to which the development intervention's objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
- D. Efficiency (report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner Countries contribution to the achievement of project objectives)

---

<sup>10</sup> Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- E. Sustainability of Project Outcomes (report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
- F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and Budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
- G. Monitoring of long-term changes
- H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)
- I. Project coordination and management (report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)
- J. Gender mainstreaming

#### **IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

##### **A. Conclusions**

This section should include a storyline of the main review conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every review criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the mid-term review report.

##### **B. Recommendations**

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should:

- be based on review findings
- realistic and feasible within a project context
- indicate institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
- be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

### **C. Lessons learned**

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the mid-term review
- For each lesson the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated

**Annexes** should include the mid-term review TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the review findings may later be appended in an annex.

## **Annex 2 - GEF minimum requirements for M&E<sup>11</sup>**

### **Minimum requirement 1: Project design of M&E**

All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and review plan by the time of work program entry for full-sized projects and CEO approval for medium-sized projects. This monitoring and review plan will contain as a minimum:

- SMART indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management;
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, indicators identified at the corporate level;
- Baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with indicator data, or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation;
- Identification of evaluations and reviews that will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluation of activities; and
- Organizational set-up and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

### **Minimum requirement 2: Application of project M&E**

Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:

- SMART indicators for implementation are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- SMART indicators for results are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- The baseline for the project is fully established and data compiled to review progress reviews, and reviews/evaluations are undertaken as planned; and
- The organizational set-up for M&E is operational and budgets are spent as planned.

---

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\\_Policy\\_2010.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf)

### Annex 3 – Checklist on independent mid-term review report quality

Independent mid-term review of UNIDO-GEF project:

**PROJECT TITLE:**

**PROJECT NUMBER:**

#### CHECKLIST ON INDEPENDENT MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT QUALITY

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation: Assessment notes	Rating
A. The independent mid-term review report presented an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable.		
B. The independent mid-term review report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing, and the ratings were well substantiated.		
C. The independent mid-term review report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes.		
D. The lessons and recommendations listed in the mid-term review report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the GEF portfolio and future projects.		
E. The independent mid-term review report included the actual project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) and actual co-financing used.		
F. The independent mid-term review report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the operation of the M&E system used during implementation, and the extent M&E was sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation.		

#### Rating system for quality of independent mid-term review reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately satisfactory = 4, Moderately unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

## Annex 4 – Required project identification and financial data

The independent mid-term review report should provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the following format, which is modeled after the project identification form (PIF).

### I. Dates

Milestone	Expected date	Actual date
Project CEO endorsement/approval date		
Project implementation start date (PAD issuance date)		
Original expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/approval document)		
Revised expected implementation end date (if any)		
Mid-term review completion		
Terminal evaluation		
Planned tracking tool date		

### II. Project framework

Project component	Activity type	GEF financing (in USD)		Co-financing (in USD)	
		Approved	Actual	Promised	Actual
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6. Project management					
<b>Total (in USD)</b>					

Activity types are:

- a) Experts, researches hired
- b) technical assistance, Workshop, Meetings or experts consultation scientific and technical analysis, experts researches hired
- c) Promised co-financing refers to the amount indicated on endorsement/approval.

### III. Co-financing

Source of co-financing (name of specific co-financiers)	Type of co-financier (e.g. government, GEF agency(ies), Bilateral and aid agency (ies), multilateral agency(ies), private sector, NGO/CSOs, other)	Type of co-financing	Project preparation – CEO endorsement/ approval stage (in USD)		Project implementation stage (in USD)		Total (in USD)	
			Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual
	...							
<b>Total co-financing (in USD)</b>								

Expected amounts are those submitted by the GEF agencies in the original project appraisal document. Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

## Annex 5 – Job descriptions



### UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant (Team leader)
<b>Main duty station and location:</b>	Home-based (with travel within the Dominican Republic)
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	Vienna, Austria (only if deemed necessary; to be paid separately from BL15)
<b>Start of contract (EOD):</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> March 2016
<b>End of contract (COB):</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2016
<b>Number of working days:</b>	25 working days

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent review function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Review is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent reviews provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Review Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for review in the UN system.

#### PROJECT CONTEXT

In December 2013, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) endorsed the full-sized project under its Climate Change Focal Area entitled "Stimulating industrial competitiveness through biomass-based, grid-connected electricity generation" for which UNIDO will act as the implementation agency. The overall objective of the project is to promote the implementation of decentralized, biomass-based energy production in industrial free zones in the Dominican Republic with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to their competitiveness.

The project has three substantive components:

- Policy support for decentralized, biomass-based energy generation
- Demonstration of proven biomass technology for electricity generation
- Supportive activities for training, promotion and dissemination

The project counts on a total budget of US\$1,300,000 in GEF grant funding

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the independent mid-term review.

## DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument of 3A accordingly (if needed);</p> <p>Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust table of review questions, depending on country specific context</li> <li>• Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field visits and meetings</li> <li>• Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework</li> </ul>	4 days	Home-based
<p>2. Briefing with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p> <p>Preparation of the inception report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed review schedule with tentative agenda for technical site visits and meetings (incl. list of stakeholders to interview); site visits and meetings planning</li> <li>• Division of review tasks with the other national evaluation consultant</li> <li>• Inception report</li> </ul>	1 day	Home-based
<p>3. Conduct technical site visits and meetings in <b>April 2016</b><sup>12</sup>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), etc. for the collection of data and clarifications</li> <li>• Agreement with the other national evaluation consultant on the structure and content of the review report and the distribution of writing tasks;</li> <li>• Review presentation of the review's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the technical site visits and meetings</li> </ul>	6 days	Within Dominican Republic

<sup>12</sup> The exact technical site visit and meeting dates will be decided in agreement with the evaluation consultants, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After field visits and meetings: Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed</li> </ul>	3 days	Skype OR Vienna, Austria (if deemed necessary)
5. Prepare the mid-term review report according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the other national evaluation consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft mid-term review report. Share the review report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft review report</li> </ul>	7 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project review report based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final mid-term review report</li> </ul>	4 days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>25 days</b>	

## MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Education:

Advanced degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas

### Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in TC project management and/or review of development projects
- Knowledge about GEF operational programs and strategies and about relevant GEF policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, incremental costs, and fiduciary standards
- Experience in the review of GEF projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

### Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Knowledge of Spanish would be an asset.

### Reporting and deliverables

- 1) At the beginning of the assignment the consultant will submit a concise inception report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept table of contents;
- 2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
  - Presentation of initial findings of the technical site visits and meetings to key national

stakeholders;

- Draft review report;
- Final review report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.

3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:

- Presentation and discussion of findings;
- Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the review report.

All reports and related documents must be in English and presented in electronic format.

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under review. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation.



**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)**

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based (with travel within the Dominican Republic)
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	N/A
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> March 2016
<b>End of Contract:</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2016
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	25 days

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. The mid-term review is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent reviews provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

**PROJECT CONTEXT**

The national evaluation consultant will evaluate the projects according to the terms of reference under the leadership of the team leader (national consultant). S/he will perform the following tasks:

<b>MAIN DUTIES</b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); in cooperation with the team leader: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in both English and local language (questionnaires, logic models) to collect these data through interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of detailed review questions to be clarified; questionnaires/interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field visits and meetings</li> <li>Drafting and presentation of brief assessment of the</li> </ul>	7 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>and/or surveys during and prior to the field visits and meetings;</p> <p>Coordinate and lead interviews/ surveys in local language and assist the team leader with translation where necessary;</p> <p>Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets; provide analysis and advice to the team leader on existing and appropriate policies for input to the mid-term review.</p>	<p>adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project.</p>		
<p>Review all project outputs/ publications/feedback;</p> <p>Briefing with the review team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>Coordinate and review the agenda for the technical site visits and meetings, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with the Project Management Unit.</p> <p>Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview notes, detailed review schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field visits and meetings.</li> <li>• Division of review tasks with the team leader.</li> <li>• Inception report.</li> </ul>	6 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<p>Coordinate and conduct the technical field visits and meetings with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required;</p> <p>Consult with the team leader on the structure and content of the review report and the distribution of writing tasks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentations of the review's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the technical field visits and meetings.</li> <li>• Agreement with the team leader on the structure and content of the review report and the distribution of writing tasks.</li> </ul>	5 days	Within Dominican Republic
<p>Prepare inputs and analysis to the review report according to TOR and as agreed with the team leader.</p>	<p>Draft review report prepared.</p>	5 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Revise the draft project review report based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Final mid-term review report prepared.	2 days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>25 days</b>	

## REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

### **Core values:**

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

### **Core competencies:**

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

### **Managerial competencies (as applicable):**

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

## MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

**Education:** Advanced university degree in environmental science, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in industrial energy efficiency and/or climate change.

### **Technical and functional experience:**

- A minimum of five years practical experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries.
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English and Spanish is required.

### **Absence of conflict of interest:**

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under review. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Office for Independent Evaluation.

## Annex 6 – Project results framework

<b>UNIDO/GEF Project: Stimulating Industrial Competitiveness Through Biomass-based, Grid-connected Electricity Generation.</b>					
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> CCM Objective 3 “Promote Investment in Renewable Energy Technologies”					
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> CCM-3 “Favourable Policy Framework Created for Renewable Energy (RE) Investments in Industrial and Commercial Applications”; “Investment in RE Technologies Increased”					
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> CCM-3 “RE Policy and Regulation in Place”; “Electricity and Heat Produced from Renewable Resources”					
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets (End of Project)</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Project Objective</b>					
To promote the implementation of decentralized, biomass-based energy production in industrial free zones in the Dominican Republic with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to their competitiveness.	CO <sub>2</sub> eq emissions	Lifetime tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq emissions avoided (0)	Lifetime tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq emissions avoided (244,800 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq)	GEF climate change mitigation tracking tool	(1) Project is implemented as planned; (2) Data to calculate CO <sub>2</sub> eq emission reductions is available
<b>Component 1</b>	<b>Policy Support for Decentralized, Biomass-based Energy Generation.</b>				
Outcome 1. The policy and regulatory environment conducive to decentralized, biomass-based power and heat generation has been strengthened.	Extent to which RE policies, regulations and strategies have been proposed.	No specific support for decentralized RE in place: level 1 GEF Tracking Tool.	Various policy measures and strategies have been proposed: level 3 GEF Tracking Tool.	Official publications; final evaluation.	(1) Sustained government commitment to strengthen policy framework; (2) Demonstrated economic, social and environmental benefits of decentralized (biomass) power generation compared to baseline situation.
Output 1.1 Regulation for decentralized biomass-based power generation (environmental impact, nuisance, and water use) has been reviewed, adjusted and streamlined.	Draft regulation and/or guidelines for: (a) Generating concession, (b) Environmental impact, (c) Nuisance, and (d) Water use.	No special regulation or guidelines on 4 issues are in place (0;0;0;0).	Specific regulation or guidelines proposed on 4 issues (1;1;1;1).	Project records; official publications.	(1) Sustained government commitment to strengthen policy framework; (2) Adequate coordination with MIMAREMA, Santiago Municipality and other relevant authorities.
Output 1.2 Proposals for financial	Proposal for financial	Law 57-07 in place; not	Proposal submitted (1).	Project records; official	(1) Sustained government commitment to

incentives to stimulate decentralized, renewable energy technologies have been prepared and submitted to the Government for approval.	incentives for small biomass power plants	effective to stimulate small decentralized biomass energy plants (0).		publications.	strengthen policy framework; (2) Economic benefits of decentralized RETs exist vs. baseline scenario and are acknowledged.
Output 1.3 Existing information sources on the biomass potential in the national territory have been validated and integrated.	Biomass resource database	Resource data fragmented and not validated; no database (0).	Updated database created (1).	Project records, field visits.	(1) Stakeholders are willing to share information and setup a national information point (database).
Output 1.4 Sustainable biomass sourcing strategies have been developed in coordination with rural development programmes in the Santiago region.	Sustainable sourcing strategies documented and endorsed by local stakeholders	Initial business proposals by CZFIS; some programmes targeting forestry in place in the region (Plan Sierra).	Strategies supported by local stakeholders (1).	Project documentation; possible MoU's with local CSOs (including smallholder groups).	(1) Viable biomass sourcing schemes can be devised; (2) local CSOs, smallholders and other stakeholders are interested to consider biomass supply as a source of income generation and land management.
<b>Component 2</b>	<b>Demonstration of Proven Biomass Technology for Electricity Generation.</b>				
<b>Outcome 2. A biomass-based electric power plant (envisaged capacity 3 MW) has been adopted by the Santiago Industrial Free Zone.</b>	<b>Installed capacity (MW); amount invested (US\$).</b>	<b>(0 MW; US\$0).</b>	<b>(3 MW<sup>13</sup>; US\$ 6.5 million).</b>	<b>Project records, field visits; final evaluation.</b>	<b>1) Project designs are technically, social, environmentally and economically feasible; 2) Project financed by project developer; 3) Equipment providers and contractors deliver promptly.</b>
Output 2.1 A detailed feasibility study for the development of an envisaged 3 MW decentralized, biomass-based electricity plant at the Santiago Free Zone has been carried out.	Feasibility study.	No full study (0).	Feasibility study completed (1).	Project documentation; appraisals by counterparts.	(1) Prefeasibility studies are positive; (2) Positive decision by CZFIS and other stakeholders to start the biomass project.
Output 2.2 Supportive studies and technical designs have been prepared, and permits and concessions obtained.	Supportive studies; permits and concessions.	No studies (0); no permits and concessions (0).	Studies completed (1); all permits and concessions obtained (1).	Project documentation; appraisals by counterparts.	(1) Input data for technical studies all available; (2) Adequate site selected and acquired; (3) Adequate access to water use, water discharge, and road infrastructure.

<sup>13</sup> Please note that final capacity may lie slightly below 3 MW.

Output 2.3 Staff from Santiago and other industrial free zones have received training on technical and managerial aspects of small-scale biomass plants	Trained people (number of persons).	No persons specifically trained (0).	Male staff (10) and female staff (10) trained (1).	Project documentation; appraisal by counterparts and beneficiaries.	(1) Demonstration plant (Output 2.4 ) in place; Key personnel has been assigned by the project operator (CZFIS);
Output 2.4 The envisaged 3 MW biomass-based electric power plant has been procured and made operational under an appropriate business model.	Business model for: (a) Power plant; (b) Biomass sourcing ; Biomass power plant.	No conceptual models in place (0; 0); No power plant (0).	Business models detailed and implemented (1; 1); Power plant operational (1).	Field visits; plant commissioning reports; bill of lading; appraisals by counterparts, final evaluation.	(1) Final project designs are technically, social, environmentally and economically feasible (Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 in place); (2) Project can be financed by project developer; (3) Equipment providers and contractors deliver promptly.
<b>Component 3</b>	<b>Supportive Activities for Training, Promotion and Dissemination.</b>				
<b>Outcome 3. Awareness for the concept and benefits of biomass power generation has been raised among relevant stakeholders.</b>	<b>Number of people that have been engaged with the concept and benefits of biomass power generation.</b>	<b>No people engaged with (0).</b>	<b>Women (50) and men (50) engaged with (1).</b>	<b>Project documentation, publications and proceedings.</b>	<b>(1) Demonstration plant procured and operational; (2) Sustained interest in biomass generation by industrial free zones.</b>
Output 3.1 A communication plan has been prepared to interact with civil society organizations and the general public in Santiago.	Communication plan.	No communication plan (0).	Communication plan (1).	Project documentation, publications; meeting minutes with CSOs.	(1) CZFIS and CZNFE are committed to engage with local stakeholders; (2) CSOs are willing interact with the Project.
Output 3.2 Operational experience and best practices from the Santiago demonstration plant have been compiled.	Best practices, especially with respect to environmental and financial performance.	Only experience with biomass based steam generation (0).	Best practices compiled (1).	Project documentation and publications.	(1) Demonstration plant procured and operational (Outputs 2.1-2.4 completed).
Output 3.3 Promotional activities including technical seminars, dissemination events, and drafting of technical manuals and guidelines, have been carried out.	Promotional activities; Manuals and guidelines.	No promotional activities (0); No manuals and guidelines (0).	Promotional activities implemented (1); Manuals and guidelines compiled (1).	Publications, seminar proceedings; Technical reports.	(1) Demonstration plant procured and operational; (2) Sustained interest in biomass generation by industrial free zones.

