SOCIAL IMPACT

ADVANCING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS

Data Collection Instruments

MCC Indonesia Green Prosperity Project

Grant Facility Performance Evaluation

October 30, 2017

This report was prepared independently by Social Impact, Inc. at the request of MCC.

Data Collection Instruments

MCC Indonesia Green Prosperity Project

Grant Facility Performance Evaluation

Submitted: October 30, 2017

Submitted to:
Millennium Challenge Corporation
875 Fifteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-2221
Contracting Officer's Representative: Shreena Patel
Contract MCC-13-BPA-0017, Task Order MCC-17-CL-0006

Submitted by:
Social Impact, Inc.
2300 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 1000
Arlington, VA 22201
703.465.1884
www.socialimpact.com

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

1 CONSENT STATEMENT

1.1 Key Informant Interview Consent Statement

"Hello, my name is [enumerator name], and I work for Social Impact, a management consulting firm based in the Washington D.C. area. We are evaluating the MCA-Indonesia Green Prosperity (GP) Project, which aims to provide grant funding to reduce GHG emissions and increase household income. Our study is funded by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), a U.S. agency that provides assistance to other countries' development projects.

The GP Project is designed to support the Government of Indonesia's commitment to a more sustainable, less carbon-intensive future by promoting environmentally sustainable, low carbon economic growth. The evaluation will aim to document the evolution of the Project's design and how the design of the Project contributed to its objectives, as well as the delivery of grants. Ultimately this study will produce a report that will generate lessons learned for MCC, MCA-I and the Government of Indonesia in the design of future facilities. This report ***will not*** *include anyone's name or identity, however. Our researchers will remove your name and other personal identifying information from documentation from this interview that will be saved for analysis.*

If you agree to participate, I will ask you about your individual interactions with the Project, your perspectives on its design and management, the costs involved in your participation in the Facility, and sustainability. You were selected for participation in this key informant interview based on your knowledge of the Facility and its portfolio of grants. These interviews are expected to take around 60-90 minutes to complete.

Any information you provide that can identify you will be kept strictly confidential by the parties conducting this study, to the maximum extent permitted by the laws of the United States and the laws of Indonesia. The information collected will be used for research purposes only, so please answer honestly.

Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to answer any or all questions for any reason. You may ask questions at any time. More broadly, members of your community and country may benefit from this study by helping MCC, MCA-I and the Government of Indonesia understand how to best support grants focused on reducing GHG emissions in Indonesia. This study poses no risk to participants. The final evaluation report will be publicly available after completion.

You may contact Ms. Danielle de Garcia, the Project Director at ddegarcia@socialimpact.com or Erika Keaveney, Interim Co-Chair of the Institutional Review Board at Social Impact Inc., at irb@socialimpact.com. If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about the study or your rights as a participant, please feel free to contact us at any time.

Do you have any questions?

By saying "yes," and participating in this study, you are indicating that you have heard this consent script, had an opportunity to ask any questions about your participation and voluntarily consent to participate.

Will you participate in this research study? You may answer yes or no. [Note: consent will be obtained orally]

☐ Yes, I am willing to participate

☐ No, I am not willing to participate

1.2 Focus Group Discussion Consent

"Hello, my name is [enumerator name], and I work for Social Impact, a management consulting firm based in the Washington D.C. area. We are evaluating the MCA-Indonesia Green Prosperity (GP) Project, which aims to provide grant funding to reduce GHG emissions and increase household income. Our study is funded by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), a U.S. agency that provides assistance to other countries' development projects.

The GP Project is designed to support the Government of Indonesia's commitment to a more sustainable, less carbon-intensive future by promoting environmentally sustainable, low carbon economic growth. The evaluation will aim to document the evolution of the Project's design and how the design of the Project contributed to its objectives, as well as the delivery of grants. Ultimately this study will produce a report that will generate lessons learned for MCC, MCA-I and the Government of Indonesia in the design of future facilities. This report ***will not*** *include anyone's name or identity, however. We will remove your name and other personal identifying information from documentation from this interview that will be saved for analysis.*

If you agree to participate, the facilitator will ask you about your interactions with the Project, your perspectives on its design and management, and the beneficial or disadvantageous aspects of the Facility. You were selected for participation in this discussion based on your knowledge of the Facility and its portfolio of grants. These discussions are expected to take around 90 minutes to complete.

Any information you provide that can identify you will be kept strictly confidential by the parties conducting this study, to the maximum extent permitted by the laws of the United States and the laws of Indonesia. The information collected will be used for research purposes only and will not be used for determining any sort of benefits or punish you for anything, so please answer honestly. We also ask that you refrain from sharing the responses of others participating in the discussion.

Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to answer any or all questions for any reason. You may ask questions at any time. To thank you for your time, you will be provided with refreshments during the discussion. More broadly, members of your community and country may benefit from this study by helping MCC, MCA-I and the Government of Indonesia understand how to best support grants focused on reducing GHG emissions in Indonesia. This study poses no risk to participants. The final evaluation report will be publicly available after completion.

You may contact Ms. Danielle de Garcia, the Project Director at ddegarcia@socialimpact.com or Erika Keaveney, Interim Co-Chair of the Institutional Review Board at Social Impact Inc., at irb@socialimpact.com. If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about the study or your rights as a participant, please feel free to contact us at any time.Do you have any questions?

By saying "yes," and participating in this study, you are indicating that you have heard this consent script, had an opportunity to ask any questions about your participation and voluntarily consent to participate.

Will you participate in this research study? You may answer yes or no. [Note: consent will be obtained orally]

☐ Yes, I am willing to participate

☐ No, I am not willing to participate

2 KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

2.1 Government of Indonesia Officials

Interview Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of Interview	
Location of Interview	
Name of Data Collector	
Name of Respondent	
Role or Position/Title of Respondent	
Male/Female/Non-Binary	
Phone number/email of Respondent	

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondent prefers to read it. Once they have provided consent, proceed with the interview.

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Please tell me about your interactions with the GP Project. a. When and how did you start working with the GP Project? b. Did your interactions of involvement change over time? How so? [PROBE: See if you can prompt the respondent to comment on efficiency, effectiveness, and equity (in terms of feeling the respondent was in a position to negotiate with the GP Project)]	1	Evolution of Design
2. In your own words, what have been the most meaningful or significant achievements of the GP Project? [PROBE: why?]	4b	Results
3. To what extent, if any, do you think any of the GP results will be sustained after the Compact ends? [PROBE: why?]	3c	Sustainability
4. Are there plans to continue the work of GP, or any of its grants?	3c	Sustainability
5. Have you worked with other climate funds or facilities? Which ones?	2	Effectiveness

Question	EQ	Theme
6. Were these facilities available to the GP Project target audience? [If no, skip to question 9]	2	Effectiveness
7. In what ways was the GP Project more effective or less effective than other facilities you have worked with? [PROBE: deal flow, selection mechanism, decision making, monitoring]	2	Effectiveness
8. Do you think the grants resulting from the GP Project were better, worse, or about the same level of quality as other grants operating in the same sector? [NOTE: If the respondent asks how we are defining quality, some dimensions we are looking at include grant design/logic, grant administration, alignment with GOI objectives, and reporting]	3a	Quality
9. Do you think the requirements of the GP Project impacted the quality of the grants? If so, how? If not, why not? [PROBE: would the quality have been better or worse if the grantees or contractors were not locally based?]	3a	Quality
10. Did grantees have any mechanism for providing feedback? To what extent was this used, and how was that feedback handled?	3	Quality
11. Have you worked with other models for reducing GHG emissions (not just financing facilities)? Which ones?	2	Effectiveness
12. Do you think the GP Project model is less effective, more effective, or about the same as other models for reducing GHG emissions? Why?	2	Effectiveness
13. Did the GP Project leverage private sector funds differently from other models? How so?	3b	Private sector
14. In what ways did the GP Project align with your (department's, Ministry's) objectives? [PROBE: are any of your current programs linked to GP, or is it feasible for integration in the future? Will the work of any of the GP grants be used by your department/Ministry?]	2a	GOI alignment, sustainability
15. Are there any areas where the GP Project was not aligned with your (department's, Ministry's) objectives?	2a	GOI alignment, sustainability
16. Is any of the work under GP expected to contribute to policy changes? In what way? If not, why not? [PROBE: for provincial and district level officials, ask about policy changes at the sub-national level]	3b	GOI alignment
17. To what extent, if any, do you think PLUP fed into the work of the GP Facility? [for provincial and district level officials, reference additional questions below at this point]	1a	PLUP, Evolution of design
18. Please tell me about the phases of your work with GP (e.g. concept note, call for proposals, TAPP grant, award, implementation) – what do you see as the major phases?	5	Successes, challenges
19. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly? [PROBE: How did GP contribute to this success?]	5	Successes, challenges
20. In your own words, what were the key successes during each stage? [PROBE: How did GP contribute to this?]	5	Successes

Question	EQ	Theme
21. In your own words, what were the key challenges during each stage? [PROBE: What was GP's role in this challenge?]	5	Challenges
22. Have you seen evidence that the GP Facility has incorporated lessons learned into its programming? Please describe.	1b	Evolution of design, lessons learned
23. Were there any portfolio-specific lessons learned? [PROBE: challenges, successes] [NOTE: portfolios include cocoa, peatland, on-grid and off-grid renewable energy, women's economic empowerment, social forestry, CBNRM, and sustainable agriculture]	5	Lessons learned
24. Have you received Green Knowledge products? How have they been useful to you? [for provincial and district level officials, reference additional questions below at this point]	1b	Green Knowledge
25. Do you have an estimate for the amount of time you and your staff spent working with the GP Project? (this includes time spent reviewing documents, in meetings, etc.)	4	Cost
26. Were there any other costs or resources that went into the GP Project from your (department, Ministry, staff)?	4	Cost

Additional Questions

These questions should be asked of provincial and district level officials who oversee areas where GP grants are being implemented.

Question	EQ	Theme
Questions Related to PLUP		
27. In your own words, how did PLUP interact with the GP Facility? [NOTE: Leave this open enough for respondents to indicate that they don't know what PLUP is]	1a	PLUP
Questions Related to Green Knowledge		
28. What support, if any, has GK provided to local government officials and representatives of civil society in developing low carbon development strategies?	1b	Green Knowledge
29. To what extent, if any, has GK contributed to capacity building for local stakeholders to encourage low carbon development policies?	1b	Green Knowledge

Conclusion

Before concluding the interview, ask: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

Once the interview is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that the final report will be published by MCC around April 2018.

2.2 MCA-Indonesia

This protocol may be used with all MCA-I staff that have worked on the GP Facility.

Interview Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of Interview	
Location of Interview	
Name of Data Collector	
Name of Respondent	
Role or Position/Title of Respondent	
Male/Female/Non-binary	
Phone number/email of Respondent	

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondent prefers to read it. Once they have provided consent, proceed with the interview.

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Please tell me about your role as it relates to the GP Facility. a. When and how did you start working with the GP Facility? b. Did your interactions, involvement, or responsibilities change over time? How so?	1	Evolution of Design
2. Please tell me about the phases of your work with GP (e.g. design, concept note, call for proposals, proposal review, TAPP grant, award, implementation) – what do you see as the major phases?	5	Successes, challenges
3. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly? [PROBE: How so?]	5	Successes, challenges
4. In your own words, what were the key challenges during each stage? a. For Window Leads, ask: What were the key challenges the grantees in your window experienced?	5	Challenges
5. In your own words, what were the key successes during each stage?	5	Successes

Timeline Review

Provide the respondent with a copy of the timeline generated by the team to serve as a visual aid. Explain:

"Our team is developing a timeline of the significant changes in the design of the GP Facility, and mapping key successes and challenges. This is a copy of what we have developed so far. Please take a moment to review."

After the respondent has taken a look, proceed with the following discussion. The discussion centers around the stages of the GP Facility, including: signing of district MOUs, decisions about geographic targeting, stakeholder engagement, drafting of the operations manual, structuring of grant windows, intake of concepts and proposals, selection of proposals for TAPP grants, shortlisting proposals, selection of grants for award, grant amendments, grant oversight. The respondent may not be familiar with all stages, so focus the conversation around the stages with which the respondent is most familiar.

Question	EQ	Theme
6. Does this timeline match your understanding of how the GP Facility has evolved? Is there anything you would change or add?	1	Evolution of Design
7. In your own words, could you please tell me about some of the major design changes to the GP Facility over time? What motivated these decisions?	1	Evolution of Design
8. In your own words, could you please describe how the portfolios came about?	1	Evolution of Design

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
9. In your own words, what have been the most meaningful or significant achievements of the GP Facility? [PROBE: why?] a. For Window Leads, ask: what have been the most significant achievements among the grants you oversee?	4b	Results
10. To what extent, if any, do you think any of the GPF results will be sustained after the Compact ends? [PROBE: Why?]	3c	Sustainability
11. In your own words, could you describe how GK contributed to the GP Facility and grant portfolios, if at all?	1b	Green Knowledge
12. Are you familiar with other grant-making funds or facilities? Which ones?	2	Effectiveness
13. Do you think the grants resulting from the GPF were better, worse, or about the same level of quality as other grants operating in the same sector? How so? [PROBE: Which grants are you comparing to?]	3a	Quality
14. Did any of the work under GP contribute to policy changes? In what way? If not, why not?	3b	GOI alignment
15. To what extent, if any, do you think PLUP fed into the work of the GP Facility?	1a	PLUP, Evolution of design

16. Have you seen evidence that the GP Facility has incorporated lessons learned into its programming? Please describe.	1b	Evolution of design, lessons learned
17. Were there any portfolio-specific lessons learned? [PROBE: challenges, successes] [NOTE: Try to get specifics of which grantees/actors were involved in the lessons learned]	5	Lessons learned

Project Logic Examination

Question	EQ	Theme
18. Based on the project logic and stated objectives of the GP Project, was the Facility approach an effective model to achieve those objectives? Why or why not?	2	Effectiveness
19. What (programmatic, operational) challenges did the Facility approach present, as compared to other models for achieving the objectives?	2	Effectiveness
20. Have you worked with other models for reducing GHG emissions (not just financing facilities)? Which ones?	2	Effectiveness
21. Do you think the GPF model is less effective, more effective, or about the same as other models for reducing GHG emissions? Why? [PROBE: Which models are you comparing to?]	2	Effectiveness

Additional Questions

Ability to answer these questions will depend on respondents' role and knowledge of the topic area. As such, some questions may be skipped if the respondent is not knowledgeable on the topic.

Question	EQ	Theme
22. To what extent do you think the grants align with GP objectives?	2b	Logic
23. Are there any grants that were not aligned with GP objectives?	2b	Logic
24. Are there particular aspects or requirements of the Facility that facilitated achievement of GP objectives? Please elaborate. a. For Window Leads: How about for the objectives covered in your window?	1a	Results
25. Are there particular aspects or requirements of the Facility that improved the quality of grant design or implementation? Please elaborate. a. For Window Leads: How about for the grants covered in your window? [NOTE: If the respondent asks how we are defining quality, some dimensions we are looking at include grant design/logic, grant administration, alignment with GOI objectives, and reporting]	3a	Quality
26. Are there particular aspects of the Facility that may have inhibited achievement of GP objectives? Please elaborate? a. For Window Leads: How about for the objectives covered in your window?	1a	Results

27. How would you describe the GP Facility's interaction with the private sector?	3b	Private sector
28. Did the GP Facility leverage private sector funds differently from other models? How so?	3b	Private sector
29. To what extent, if any, do you think the GP Facility has impacted future investment? Could you please share specific examples?	3b	Sustainability
30. Are there plans for the GOI or other parties to continue the work of GP, or any of its grants?	3c	Sustainability
31. What analysis, if any, was done to determine the sustained financial viability of grants?	3c	Sustainability
32. [Economic Analysis Team] How were quantitative GHG reductions or improved incomes taken into account in making the award decision?	4	Results
33. [Economic Analysis Team] Please explain the process of the economic analysis (valuation)?	4c	Benefit Streams
34. [Economic Analysis Team] Were all main relevant benefit streams included? If not, why not?	4c	Benefit Streams
35. [Economic Analysis Team] How reliable do you believe the unit values for benefits are?	4c	Benefit Streams
36. [Economic Analysis Team] ERR is a pass-fail. Why is financial sustainability not a pass/fail consideration?	4c	Sustainability
37. [Social and Gender Analysis Team] How was the WEE portfolio distinct from the other GP portfolios?	2b	Gender
38. [SGA Team] In your own words, what were the objectives of the WEE portfolio? [PROBE: How is this related to the overall GP objectives?]	2b	Effectiveness
39. [Environmental and Social Protection Team]: How did the IFC performance standards contribute to the design and implementation of the Facility?	1	Design
40. [ESP Team]: Are there any aspects of the IFC performance standards that constrained the Facility?	5	Challenges

Conclusion

Before concluding the interview, ask: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

Once the interview is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that the team will be back in Jakarta for a debrief in March 2018.

2.3 GP Facility Grant Managers (including PMC, GPM, PDU)

This protocol may be used with contractors hired to manage the GP Facility grant portfolios.

Interview Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of Interview	
Location of Interview	
Name of Data Collector	
Name of Respondent	
Role or Position/Title of Respondent	
Male/Female/Non-Binary	
Phone number/email of Respondent	

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondent prefers to read it. Once they have provided consent, proceed with the interview.

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Please tell me about your role as it relates to the GP Facility. a. When and how did you start working with the GP Facility? b. Did your interactions of involvement change over time? How so?	1	Evolution of Design
2. What was your role in the operations and management of the GP Facility?	2	Management
3. Please tell me about the phases of your organization's work with GP (e.g. design, concept note, call for proposals, proposal review, TAPP grant, award, implementation) – what do you see as the major phases?	5	Successes, challenges
4. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly? [PROBE: What was GP's contribution in this?]	5	Successes, challenges
5. In your own words, what were the key challenges during each stage? a. What were the key challenges the grantees in your window(s) experienced? [NOTE: To the extent possible, draw out GP's involvement/contribution in this]	5	Challenges

Question	EQ	Theme
6. In your own words, what were the key successes during each stage?	5	Successes

Timeline Review

Provide the respondent with a copy of the timeline generated by the team to serve as a visual aid. Explain:

"Our team is developing a timeline of the significant changes in the design of the GP Facility, and mapping key successes and challenges. This is a copy of what we have developed so far. Please take a moment to review."

After the respondent has taken a look, proceed with the following discussion. The discussion centers around the stages of the GP Facility, including: signing of district MOUs, decisions about geographic targeting, stakeholder engagement, drafting of the operations manual, structuring of grant windows, intake of concepts and proposals, selection of proposals for TAPP grants, shortlisting proposals, selection of grants for award, grant amendments, grant oversight. The respondent may not be familiar with all stages, so focus the conversation around the stages with which the respondent is most familiar.

Question	EQ	Theme
7. Does this timeline match your understanding of how the GP Facility has evolved? Is there anything you would change or add?	1	Evolution of Design
8. In your own words, could you please tell me about some of the major design changes to the GP Facility over time? What motivated these decisions?	1	Evolution of Design
9. In your own words, could you please describe how the portfolios came about?	1	Evolution of Design

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
10. In your own words, what have been the most meaningful or significant achievements of the GP Facility? [PROBE: why?] a. What have been the most significant achievements among the grants you oversee?	4b	Results
11. To what extent, if any, do you think any of the GPF results will be sustained after the Compact ends? [PROBE: Why?]	3c	Sustainability
12. Did you face any challenges in supporting and overseeing the grant portfolios? a. How did you adapt to these challenges?	2	Management
13. In your own words, could you describe how GK contributed to the GP Facility and grant portfolios, if at all?	1b	Green Knowledge
14. Are you familiar with other grant-making funds or facilities? Which ones?	2	Effectiveness

Question	EQ	Theme
15. Do you think the grants resulting from the GPF were better, worse, or about the same level of quality as other grants operating in the same sector? [NOTE: What other grants is the respondent comparing to?]	3a	Quality
16. Did any of the work under GP contribute to policy changes? In what way? If not, why not? [NOTE: if it's too early for actual policy change, ask about discussions about policy changes]	3b	GOI alignment
17. To what extent, if any, do you think PLUP fed into the work of the GP Facility?	1a	PLUP, Evolution of design
18. Have you seen evidence that the GP Facility has incorporated lessons learned into its programming? Please describe.	1b	Evolution of design, lessons learned
19. Were there any portfolio-specific lessons learned? [PROBE: challenges, successes]	5	Lessons learned

Project Logic Examination

Question	EQ	Theme
20. Based on the project logic and stated objectives of the GP Project, was the Facility approach an effective model to achieve those objectives? Why or why not?	2	Effectiveness
21. To what extent do you think the grants align with GP objectives?	2b	Logic
22. Have you worked with other models for reducing GHG emissions (not just financing facilities)? Which ones?	2	Effectiveness
23. Do you think the GPF model is less effective, more effective, or about the same as other models for reducing GHG emissions? Why? [NOTE: what other models are being used for comparison?]	2	Effectiveness
24. What (programmatic, operational) challenges did the Facility approach present, as compared to other models for achieving the objectives?	2	Effectiveness
25. Are there particular aspects of the Facility that facilitated achievement of GP objectives? Please elaborate. a. How about for the objectives covered in the window(s) you oversee?	1a	Results
26. Are there particular aspects of the Facility that may have inhibited achievement of GP objectives? Please elaborate? a. How about for the objectives covered in the window(s) you oversee?	1a	Results
27. How would you describe the GP Facility's interaction with the private sector? [NOTE: this is not relevant for Window 2 GPMs]	3b	Private sector
28. Did the GP Facility leverage private sector funds differently from other models? How so? [NOTE: this is not relevant for Window 2 GPMs]	3b	Private sector
29. To what extent, if any, do you think the GP Facility has impacted future investment? Could you please share specific examples?	3b	Sustainability
30. Are there plans to continue the work of GP, or any of its grants?	3c	Sustainability

Question	EQ	Theme
31. What role did the audited financial report play into the evaluation of a proposed project?	3c	Sustainability
32. Are there any other alternatives that should have been mainstreamed to achieve a more sustainable impact?	3c	Sustainability

Conclusion

Before concluding the interview, ask: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

Once the interview is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that the team will be back in Jakarta for a debrief in March 2018.

2.4 MCC - Washington

This protocol may be used with all MCC staff based in Washington, DC or Jakarta that have worked on the GP Facility.

Interview Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of Interview	
Location of Interview	
Name of Data Collector	
Name of Respondent	
Role or Position/Title of Respondent	
Male/Female/Non-binary	
Phone number/email of Respondent	

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondent prefers to read it. Once they have provided consent, proceed with the interview.

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Please tell me about your role as it relates to the GP Facility. a. When and how did you start working with the GP Facility? b. Did your interactions of involvement change over time? How so?	1	Evolution of Design
2. Please tell me about the phases of your work with GP (e.g. design, concept note, call for proposals, proposal review, TAPP grant, award, implementation) – what do you see as the major phases?	5	Successes, challenges
3. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly?	5	Successes, challenges
4. In your own words, what were the key challenges during each stage?	5	Challenges
5. In your own words, what were the key successes during each stage?	5	Successes

Timeline Review

Provide the respondent with a copy of the timeline generated by the team to serve as a visual aid. Explain:

"Our team is developing a timeline of the significant changes in the design of the GP Facility, and mapping key successes and challenges. This is a copy of what we have developed so far. Please take a moment to review."

After the respondent has taken a look, proceed with the following discussion. The discussion centers around the stages of the GP Facility, including: signing of district MOUs, decisions about geographic targeting, stakeholder engagement, drafting of the operations manual, structuring of grant windows, intake of concepts and proposals, selection of proposals for TAPP grants, shortlisting proposals, selection of grants for award, grant amendments, grant oversight. The respondent may not be familiar with all stages, so focus the conversation around the stages with which the respondent is most familiar.

Question	EQ	Theme
6. Does this timeline match your understanding of how the GP Facility has evolved? Is there anything you would change or add?	1	Evolution of Design
7. In your own words, could you please tell me about some of the major design changes to the GP Facility over time? What motivated these decisions?	1	Evolution of Design
8. In your own words, could you please describe how the portfolios came about?	1	Evolution of Design

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
9. In your own words, what have been the most meaningful or significant achievements of the GP Facility? [PROBE: why?]	4b	Results
10. To what extent, if any, do you think any of the GPF results will be sustained after the Compact ends? [PROBE: Why?]	3c	Sustainability
11. In your own words, could you describe how GK contributed to the GP Facility and grant portfolios, if at all?	1b	Green Knowledge
12. How did the GP Facility proposal review process compare to that of other MCC facilities?	3a	Quality
13. Do you think the GPF model is less effective, more effective, or about the same as other models for reducing GHG emissions? Why?	2	Effectiveness
14. To what extent, if any, do you think PLUP fed into the work of the GP Facility?	1a	PLUP, Evolution of design
15. Have you seen evidence that the GP Facility has incorporated lessons learned into its programming? Please describe.	1b	Evolution of design, lessons learned
16. Were there any portfolio-specific lessons learned? [PROBE: challenges, successes]	5	Lessons learned

Question	EQ	Theme
17. Are there plans to continue the work of GP, or any of its grants?	3c	Sustainability
18. What analysis, if any, was done to determine the sustained financial viability of grants?	3c	Sustainability
19. Do you have an estimate for the amount of time you and your staff spent working with the GP Facility? (this includes time spent reviewing documents, in meetings)	4	Cost
20. Are there any other operational costs you (or your team) incurred? (e.g. travel)	4	Cost

Project Logic Examination

Question	EQ	Theme
21. Based on the project logic and stated objectives of the GP Project, was the Facility approach an effective model to achieve those objectives? Why or why not?	2	Effectiveness
22. To what extent do you think the grants align with the GP objectives?	2b	Logic
23. Are you familiar with other models for reducing GHG emissions? Which ones?		
24. What (programmatic, operational) challenges did the Facility approach present, as compared to other models for achieving the objectives? [This question does not need to be asked of MCA-I leadership]	2	Effectiveness
25. Are there particular aspects of the Facility that facilitated achievement of GP objectives? Please elaborate.	1a	Results
26. Are there particular aspects of the Facility that may have inhibited achievement of GP objectives? Please elaborate?	1a	Results

Conclusion

Before concluding the interview, ask: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

Once the interview is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that the team will deliver a debrief in Washington in March 2018.

2.5 Grantee

This protocol may be used with all MCC staff based in Washington, DC that have worked on the GP Facility.

Interview Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of Interview	
Location of Interview	
Name of Data Collector	
Name of Respondent	
Respondent's Organization	
Role or Title/Position of Respondent	
Male/Female/Non-binary	
Phone number/email of Respondent	

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondent prefers to read it. Once they have provided consent, proceed with the interview.

Interview Questions

Ask the interview questions below. Points to probe throughout the interview are shown in brackets [ ].

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Please tell me about the project you are implementing with GP funding. a. Is your project operational? b. In your own words, what are the primary benefits you are offering the community?	N/A	Portfolios
2. Please tell me about your role as it relates to the GP Project. a. When and how did you start working with the GP Facility? b. Did your interactions of involvement change over time? How so? [PROBE: See if you can prompt the respondent to comment on efficiency, effectiveness, and equity (in terms of feeling the respondent was in a position to negotiate with the GP Project)]	1	Evolution of Design
3. In your own words, what has been the most meaningful or significant achievement of your project? [PROBE: How did GP contribute to this?]	4b	Results
4. Why did you apply for financing through the GP Project?	2	Effectiveness
5. Have you ever applied for a grant or loan for a similar project? If so, were you successful? If not, why not?	2	Effectiveness
6. How do you think the quality of your approved grant compares to other grants you have received, or might receive through other processes? [NOTE: What is the point of comparison?]	3a	Quality
7. Please tell me about the phases of your work with GP (e.g. concept note, call for proposals, TAPP grant, award, implementation) – what do you see as the major phases?	5	Successes, challenges
8. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly for your specific portfolio or sector? [PROBE: What was GP's role in this?]	5	Successes, challenges
9. In your own words, what were the key challenges during each stage? [PROBE: How did GP help or hinder with this?]	5	Challenges
10. In your own words, what were the key successes during each stage? [PROBE: What was GP's contribution to this?]	5	Successes

Project Logic Examination

Question	EQ	Theme
11. How does your project relate to the GP objectives?	2b	Logic
12. Are there particular aspects of the GP Project that helped you achieve your objectives? Please elaborate.	1	Effectiveness

Question	EQ	Theme
13. Are there particular aspects of the GP Project that may have inhibited achievement of your objectives? Please elaborate.	2	Effectiveness
14. Are you aware of any changes in the design or operation of the GP Project? How did it affect your project?	1	Evolution of design
15. Are you familiar with the work of PLUP? How did it contribute to your project, if at all?	1a	PLUP, evolution of design
16. Could you have completed your project without GP Project financing? Why or why not?	4	Cost

Economic Rate of Return

Provide respondents with a copy of their project's economic rate of return for their reference.

Question	EQ	Theme
17. Did the ERR capture all the benefits that your project is generating?	4c	Benefits
18. How, if at all, are you reaching vulnerable populations?	4c	Benefits
19. Are the benefits that were forecast in the ERR coming about? Do they exceed, equal, or fall below the forecast?	4c	Benefits
20. Are actual revenues equal to or greater than what was projected in your business model?	4c	Benefits
21. What were your total costs incurred for this project? a. If you incurred costs beyond what was in the proposal, what additional costs did you incur?	4a	Cost

Interview Questions

Question	EQ	Theme
22. How will your experience with the GP Facility influence your future work or efforts to secure funding/financing?	3a	Quality
23. Do you plan to continue the work of your project?	3c	Sustainability
24. What strategies do you have for making your project sustainable? Did the GP Facility influence these strategies?	3	Sustainability
25. What are your funding sources for project continuation?	3c	Sustainability
26. How did you document lessons learned? Did you share these with MCA-I? What was their response?	1b	Lesson Learned
27. Have you seen evidence that the GP Facility has incorporated lessons learned into its programming? Please describe.	1b	Lessons learned, evolution of design
28. Are you aware of any GK efforts to document successes, challenges, or lessons learned from your project? Please describe.	1b	Green Knowledge

Additional Questions

Use the questions below to inquire about specific portfolios.

Question	EQ	Theme
Windows 1 and 3		
29. Did you receive a TAPP grant from the GP Facility?	3a	Quality
30. Would you have been able to complete the work and obtain funding without the TAPP grant?	3a	Quality
Window 3B		
31. Did you have a signed Power Purchase Agreement at the time you applied for a grant?	5	Successes, challenges
32. Were there any problems in finalizing the Power Purchase Agreement?	5	Successes, challenges
33. Did these problems either slow down the project or increase the cost?	5	Successes, challenges
34. Did other sources of funding require a power purchase agreement?	3	Effectiveness
35. Are you seeing positive benefits from the community benefits sharing program? What are they?	5	Successes, challenges
36. Is the community benefit sharing program negatively impacting your ability to make payments to the creditor?	5	Successes, challenges
Window 3A		
37. The funding required a special purpose vehicle with community ownership. How is that working out? Is that having any major problems?	5	Successes, challenges
Renewable Energy Projects		
38. How many megawatts is your project?	N/A	Portfolio
39. Now that operations/implementation is underway, are you collecting sufficient revenue to pay for operating costs? To pay for a capital fund to replace capital when needed? [NOTE: Drop if grantees are not far enough along to answer this]	3c	Sustainability
40. If not, what corrective measures are you taking? What are the reasons that you are unable to pay for operating costs?	3c	Sustainability

Conclusion

Before concluding the interview, ask: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

Once the interview is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that the final report will be published by MCC around April 2018.

3 FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

3.1 MCA-Indonesia Staff

This protocol may be used with all MCA-I staff that have worked on the GP Facility. Supervisors and non-supervisors should be in different FGDs.

FGD Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of FGD			
Location of FGD			
Name of Facilitator			
Name of Notetaker			
Name of Respondents			
Role or Position/Title of Respondents			
Length of time at MCA-I or with MCC [select for each respondent]	< 2 years	2-3 years	4+ years
Number of Male/Female/Non-binary Respondents			

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondents prefer to read it. Once all respondents have provided consent, proceed with the discussion.

Discussion Questions

Question	EQ	Theme
1. What do you think was advantageous about the structure of the GP Facility and its supporting contractors?	2a	Management
2. Were there any aspects of the structure that presented challenges?	2a	Management
3. What do you see as the key deliverables and products of GP?	4b	Management

Timeline Review

Provide respondents with a copy of the timeline generated by the team to serve as a visual aid. Explain:

"Our team is developing a timeline of the significant changes in the design of the GP Facility, and mapping key successes and challenges. This is a copy of what we have developed so far. Please take a moment to review."

After the respondents have taken a look, proceed with the following discussion.

Question	EQ	Theme
4. Does this timeline match your understanding of how the GP Facility has evolved? Is there anything you would change or add?	1	Evolution of Design
5. Why did each of these changes occur? What was the impact of each change?	1	Evolution of Design
6. What do you think was advantageous about the design or processes of the GP Facility and its supporting contractors?	2a	Evolution of design, management
7. Were there any aspects that presented challenges?	2a	Evolution of design, management

Phase-by-Phase Discussion

Before the FGD, you should have posted signs around the room, or on one wall, that read:

- *Design*
- *Concept Note*
- *Call for Proposals*
- *Proposal Review*
- *TAPP Grant*
- *Grant Award*
- *Implementation*
- *Closeout*

Ask participants which Windows they are most familiar with. If there is representation across all Windows, then separate the discussion by GK vs Window 1&3 and Window 2, as they followed different processes. Refer participants to these phases for the next part of the discussion.

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly for your specific portfolio or sector? [PROBE: What was GP's role in this?]	5	Successes, challenges
2. What were the key challenges during each stage? [PROBE: What was GP's contribution?]	5	Challenges
3. What were the key successes during each stage? [PROBE: What was GP's contribution?]	5	Successes

Conclusion

Before concluding the discussion, ask: “Is there anything else you would like to add?”

Once the discussion is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that the team will deliver a debrief of the evaluation in Jakarta in March 2018.

3.2 Grantees

This protocol may be used with all GP grant recipients. If there are enough grant recipients in a certain location for multiple focus groups, the team may wish to break up groups by Window or portfolio.

FGD Tracking Data

This section will be completed by the interviewer prior to the key informant interview

Date of FGD	
Location of FGD	
Name of Facilitator	
Name of Notetaker	
Name of Respondents	
Role or Position/Title of Respondents	
Number of Male/Female/Non-binary Respondents	

Introduction

Read the consent statement, and offer respondents the opportunity to ask questions. Have copies of the statement available in case the respondents prefer to read it. Once all respondents have provided consent, proceed with the discussion.

Introductory Questions

Question	EQ	Theme
1. Please briefly (no more than 2 minutes) about your GP-funded project.	N/A	Portfolio
2. How long have you had your GP grant?	N/A	Portfolio

Discussion Questions

Ask whether each participant has worked with other climate funding/financing mechanisms besides the GP Facility. If less than half of respondents answer "Yes", skip to question 7. If more than half, proceed with question 3 onwards.

Question	EQ	Theme
3. Which other climate funding/financing mechanisms have you worked with?	2	Comparison, effectiveness
4. How was the GP Project different from other climate funding mechanisms?	2	Comparison, effectiveness
5. Are there any points of similarity?	2	Comparison, effectiveness
6. Were the differences beneficial or detrimental	2	Comparison, effectiveness
7. Do you think you could have achieved the results of your grant through another model? What would have been better or worse, based on other models you have seen?	2	Effectiveness
8. Do you think the quality of your approved grant was better, worse, or about the same as it would have been through another process? Why or why not?	2	Effectiveness
9. Would you use the GP Project again? If not, why not? If so, why?	5	Successes, challenges

Phase-by-Phase Discussion

Before the FGD, you should have posted signs around the room, or on one wall, that read:

- *Call for Proposals*
- *Grant Award*
- *Implementation*
- *Closeout*

Refer participants to these phases for the next part of the discussion.

Question	EQ	Theme
10. Did any part of the process seem to work particularly well or particularly poorly for your specific portfolio or sector?	5	Successes, challenges
11. What were the key challenges during each stage?	5	Challenges
12. What were the key successes during each stage?	5	Successes

Conclusion

Before concluding the discussion, ask: "Is there anything else you would like to add?"

Once the discussion is over, thank the respondent for their time and let them know that MCC will publish the evaluation report around April 2018.

SOCIAL IMPACT, INC.
2300 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1000
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

SOCIAL IMPACT

ADVANCING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS