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SGP India 1995 - 2008

• 1995 - Development Alternatives as first NHI
2000 - Centre for Environment Education (CEE)

• Funded 2001-08: 257 projects ($ 5.8 mill)
Co-financing Leveraged: $ 7.1 million

• Scaling up 27 best practices: beyond grant making & influencing policy on key environmental issues

• Decentralized, transparent & efficient modality encourages maximum in- country ownership through the strong National Steering Committee & NHI
SGP India 1995 - 2008

- GoI provides annual scaling up grant of $100,000 last three years

- UNDP CO provides $700,000 (2008-10) MoEF-GEF co-financing RAF ($ 2.4 mill: 2007 - 10)

- Public & private sectors providing technical, management, financial support

SGP Program Co Financing

Grants Received Vs. Project Co-financing

- Total grant Allocated from GEF in USD $0
- Total Co financing (cash + kind) in USD $0
USP of SGP India 2001-08

• “Host NGO” CEE has 7 regional offices
  ➢ Promotes a balanced thematic and geographical coverage
  ➢ SGP leverages CEE’s in house expertise
  ➢ Decentralizes processes and is cost effective

• Community based ‘participatory approach’ through PRAs, formation and institutionalisation of SHGs

  • SOPs for effective management
  • Inception/closure workshops with stakeholders during project cycle
  • Identity through project branding
Conventional and Improved devices

Entrepreneurial Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneur</th>
<th>Average price</th>
<th>Total revenue</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyeing stoves</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>465000</td>
<td>393700</td>
<td>71300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleaching stoves</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>57500</td>
<td>12500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>535000</td>
<td>451200</td>
<td>83800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Principles for GEF UNDP SGP: Policy

All projects monitoring is mandatory. It is based on the key principles:

- Regular intervals in projects – learning & mentoring than policing
- Supports and understand where are the problems and challenges eg measurability, perception variance, scaling up and replication
- Checks the progress and intended outcomes
  - What has been achieved and what are the impacts
- How it affects the range of stakeholders including communities
Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in SGP

- Facilitate One to One meetings to understand the projects outline
- Encourage presentations by the proponents on projects at various levels with different stakeholders
- Enabling Leveraging Resources, Co financing, partnerships and Knowledge Sharing
- Ensure Exposure Visits to the project site and areas of similar projects
- Standard operating procedures (SOPs)
- Impact Assessment by the project on primary and secondary stakeholders benefits

One to One Meetings (After the project sanctioned)

- Discussions on the project presentations - idea by the proponent
- Learn key activities which lead to the outcomes in the project
- Review the local capacity of the partners to deliver the outcomes from the project
- Learn & Exchange the past performance similar works and relevant experiences of the partner in doing
- Review the cost estimates, link it, leverages with range of stakeholders
- Promote Baselines development, develop indicators for assessment
Field Visits to Projects (During the Project)

This is an ongoing system during and after the project: both at the Implementing Institution and Communities

- Evaluate the progress, outcomes and impacts
- Co-financing generated; links established with Govt.; policy and advocacy impacted and involved
- How and what is being done to achieve sustainability both at the institutional level and the project level
- Communities involvement at all levels monitoring, sharing costs, links to banks, markets, institutes for capacity building

Pro Active Partnership

- Quarterly Reports, Mid Term Report, Final Reports.
- Special Knowledge based documentation
- Common In country Website, India and UNDP Global
- 25 Guiding Notes
- Common E mail Exchange system, Sharing
- Scaling up and Replication Systems
Thank you

For more information, please contact
prabhjot.sodhi@ceeindia.org
prabhjot.sodhi@undp.org

Monitoring

• **Means:** To check progress, watch, track, find relative position…..

• **Answers questions like:** What progress have we made, where are the problems, How far have we gone, How much more to go…..

• **When done:** ongoing, regular intervals

• **Consumers:** Project staff, external stakeholders, usually internal to project
Evaluation

• **Means**: To find what project has achieved against promise

• **Answers questions like**: Have we delivered what we set out, How well have we done, where we could have done better

• **When done**: Usually end of project, sometimes mid-term. Always during specific milestone periods

• **Consumers**: Mainly external

What to Monitor?

• **Inputs** - Money, Material, Human resources….

• **Activities** - What has been done, when, how much…

• **Processes** - how these are done, quality

• **Outcomes/effects**: Result of activities

• **Capacities**: Individual & Institutional
What to Monitor?

- **Outputs** - How far are we from achieving stated log frame outputs
- **Impact** - are communities better off now, project cost effectiveness, targeting, etc
- **Assumptions**: Have they changed?
- **Key cross cutting issues**:
  - Equity
  - Sustainability
  - Poverty
  - Gender

Why Monitor?

- For understanding project progress
- Understanding emerging impact and outcomes
- Fine tuning strategies, approaches
- To feed into planning
- Value for money
- And much more…
- All of the above have learning as key objective
How do projects learn?

- Listening
- Experimenting
- Documenting – good practices & failures
- Reviewing & analysing
- Reflecting
- Identifying gray areas
- Addressing constraints and problems
- Fora – formal and informal to discuss openly
- Occasional independent feedback

Some generalized problems..

- Passing data on to ‘God’ for whatever use
- Top down and one way
- Involvement of staff and community
- Too much data, too little analysis
- Optimum ignorance and appropriate imprecision
- Too fixed, with no reviews of the system
- Qualitative given the go by
- Recognition of different parts of the monitoring system – documents, meetings, field visits as one whole package
Some generalized problems:

- Static
- Load on community
- Sputtering cycle of action-analysis-reporting-feedback
- Separating trend analysis from regular data
- Separating activities, outputs, outcomes and impact
- Poor indicators
- Use of modern tools – video, satellite imagery
- Timing of data collection

PROCESS MONITORING:

- Detailed process mapping
- Developing indicators and tools
- Peer review mechanisms
- Feed into capacity building plans
- Not to be a policing exercise
- Link to performance appraisal
OUTPUT MONITORING:

- Here refers to Log Frame Outputs
- Outputs themselves cannot be usually monitored
- Indicators to be developed
- Indicators to be updated, if required

Impact Monitoring

- **Means:** To measure changes in the hands of community, for whom the project works.
- **Answers questions like:** What has been the impact of the project on the community’s livelihoods…
- **When done:** Can be conducted anytime! Monitoring of impacts give vital clues for re-strategising. End of Project is usually for evaluations.
- **Consumers:** All stakeholders
• Developing indicators
• Testing attrIBUTABILITY
• Recognise and factor in limitations & problems
• Impact could be +/-, direct/indirect, intended/un-intended.
• Project is responsible for delivering outputs not impacts.
• If risks come true, impact may not happen in spite of outputs being met