

**Joint Mission on CTF Investment Plan Preparation
Template for Post-Joint Mission Reporting to MDB Committee**

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Reporting MDB | International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) |
| 2. Mission Details: | |
| • Country | Kazakhstan |
| • MDBs Involved | IBRD, IFC, EBRD |
| • Mission Leader | Gary Stuggins |
| • Mission Dates | June 15-24, 2009 ¹ |
| • Mission Category | Category 1 (public-private) |
| • Total number of Staff Weeks Budgeted | IBRD: 10 staff weeks ² |
| • Budget Endorsed by MDB Committee | IBRD: \$91,410 |
| • TFC Review Date | March 2010 |
| 3. Manpower Input – Actual vs. Budgeted (summarize here any significant differences in actual vs. budgeted staff-weeks inputs) | |
| <p>Actual total IBRD manpower input for the team was 5.77 staff weeks plus 60 days of consultant time – compared with the budgeted time of 10 staff weeks. In addition, there were \$7,000 allocated for central unit costs. No consultant time was explicitly shown in the initial budget, but Table 1 corrects for this omission keeping the overall budget envelope at the level endorsed by the MDB Committee.</p> <p>The total actual expenditures have amounted to \$96,136. The cost overrun by \$4,726 (5.6%) occurred mainly because of an additional follow-up trip undertaken by a consultant. One mission was originally planned for the development of the Investment Plan (IP), but the additional trip became necessary to fill in information gaps, confirm the proposed priority interventions, and discuss the Government’s reluctance to provide sovereign guarantees.</p> | |
| 4. Mission Costs Charged to CTF – Actual vs. Budgeted (explain here briefly any significant differences between actual vs. budgeted) | |
| <p>The costs of the full mission in June 2009 budgeted at \$23,000 turned out to be about \$22,008. However, as mentioned above, a follow-up mission was necessary, which added another \$5,077 charged to CTF. The resulting total mission costs are about \$27,085 (see Table 1 for details).</p> | |
| 5. Mission Cost Sharing (summarize opportunity for and extent of sharing mission) | |

¹ The dates refer to the full team mission in June 2010. The follow-up trip to Kazakhstan by consultant Victor Loksha on October 5-15, 2009 is categorized in Table 1 as post-mission activity.

² The number of staff-weeks in the original budget was calculated without separation into staff and consultant time.

cost with non-CTF MDB activities)

50% of the follow-up mission costs in October 2009 were co-financed by the Global Gas Flaring Reduction Program. In addition, EBRD co-financed the costs of the consultant services related to the development of its CTF supported components of the investment plan.

6. Lessons Learned:**a. Pre-mission Preparation (e.g. extent, adequacy, importance)**

- Pre-mission preparation requires a considerable commitment of staff and consultant time; some of their work starts before the budget is available from CTF;
- Pre-mission work in this case absorbed 18.6% of the amount budgeted from CTF;
- Coordination of MDB efforts (IBRD, IFC, and EBRD) was essential for planning and undertaking the mission;
- Engagement of the counterparts in Kazakhstan was attempted early on by VC, but the full mission in June 2009 was essential for identifying the key intervention areas for CTF as the VC was found to be of little benefit;
- It was helpful to have prepared written material about CTF and its projects in other countries prior to the mission;
- Quality translation of documents into Russian for the audiences in Kazakhstan is an effort not to be underestimated;
- After the full mission in June 2009, a follow-up trip by a consultant proved necessary to complete the preparation of the IP.
- The Government was much less prepared to discuss low carbon development than originally expected.

b. MDB Coordination (including pre and post mission)

- Coordination of MDB efforts and inputs was essential throughout the IP preparation process;
- In areas where IFC and EBRD had potential overlap (e.g., energy efficiency through financial intermediaries and district heating) the roles had to be clarified and agreed upon prior to finalizing the IP.

c. Coordination with Government (extent and strength of country leadership and inputs in developing IP)

- At the outset, the Government of Kazakhstan (GoK) informed the MDBs that the Ministry of Environment is the main counterpart for MDBs on the Climate Investment Funds in Kazakhstan;
- The June 2009 mission showed that GoK was not prepared to provide state guarantees for borrowing from the CTF, although several line ministries and agencies had an interest in accessing CTF funds. The second mission followed up on these project options. However, eventually the GoK confirmed that it would

| |
|--|
| <p>not provide sovereign guarantees and the IP was limited to areas where the support of EBRD and IFC could be used;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed borrowers from EBRD/IFC include a number of public and private companies; • The workshop held in Almaty in February 2010 (details below) confirmed the endorsement by GoK of the CTF areas of intervention reflected in the IP. Participation of the government and non-government agencies at the workshop was strong. |
| <p>d. Coordination with UN Agencies and Bilateral and Other Multilateral donors (extent of participation in mission work, scope and consultations)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to close interaction with the EBRD throughout the IP preparation process, the mission members had consultations in June 2009 with representatives of the European Commission and USAID; • The mission cooperated with the UNDP in engaging the Kazakh counterparts in discussions on the 2nd National Communication to UNFCCC and consulted relevant UNDP/GEF reports. <p>e. Involvement of NGOs and Greater Civil Society in IP Preparation Process (nature and scope of participation/consultation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized by EBRD with co-operation from IFC, a public consultation was held on the IP, along with an invitation to provide feedback through a web-based element. The workshop was held in Almaty on 12 February 2010, chaired by the Ministry of Environment. The consultation was held in accordance with the EBRD rules governing disclosure and ran from 4 February to 19 February 2010; • Participation at the workshop was strong, with 20 organizations participating. Furthermore, seven written comments were received. |
| <p>f. Other Aspects of Mission Work</p> |
| <p>g. Additional Comments or Suggestions for Enhancement of Joint Mission Process</p> |

**CTF Joint Mission Composition and Assignments
June 14-24, 2009**

| Mission member | Agency | Assignment | Contribution to mission outputs |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------------------|--|
| Gary Stuggins – Lead | IBRD | Led preparation of IP. | Coordinated IBRD |

| | | | |
|--|------|---|---|
| Energy Economist | | | involvement and consistency with the ECA Energy sector strategy and policies, as well as consistency with CTF requirements, criteria and modalities. |
| Aliya Mukay – Operations Officer (with support from Christophe Bosch – Country Sector Coordinator) | IBRD | Liaison with the GoK counterparts in development of IP. | Coordinated IP development in accordance with the Country Partnership Strategy and national sustainable development priorities. |
| Victor Loksha – Consultant | IBRD | Drafted sections of IP and coordinated inputs to the IP from EBRD and IFC. | Made inputs to Draft IP covering: a) country context; b) overview of GHG emissions; c) identification of priority sectors for CTF and rationale for selection; d) policy and enabling environment; e) implementation potential and risks. |
| Andreas Biermann – Principal Policy Manager, Energy Efficiency and Climate Change | EBRD | Joint team leader. Provided consistency with CTF implementation within EBRD and link to operations at HQ. | Responsible for draft IP on EBRD side, including project details and ensuring that project conforms to EBRD strategy. |
| Anvar Nasritdinov – Business Development Manager, Energy Efficiency and Climate Change | EBRD | Provided project-specific inputs to EBRD sections in IP. | Provided project-specific inputs to EBRD sections in IP, including draft financing plan. |
| Eric Peter – Senior Investment Officer (Infrastructure) | IFC | Responsible for IFC inputs to IP. | Provided IFC inputs on district heating and coordinated inputs from other IFC teams. |

Table 1. CTF Budget Utilization by IBRD

| Kazakhstan CTF Investment Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| IBRD Preparation Budget | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Summary of Staff Week Inputs and Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (B=Budgeted, A=Actual) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MDB | Total Number of Staff Weeks | | Average Staff Week Rate of Team | | Total Staff Week Costs | | Mission Travel & Subsistence Costs | | Consultants | | TOTAL | | Difference Between Budget Total and Actual Total |
| | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | |
| IBRD | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | |
| Pre-Mission | 1.69 | 1.92 | \$ 4,500 | \$ 5,566 | \$ 7,587 | \$ 10,681 | \$ - | | \$ 5,000 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 12,587 | \$ 15,681 | \$ (3,095) |
| Mission | 2.25 | 3.24 | \$ 5,700 | \$ 5,566 | \$ 12,813 | \$ 18,040 | \$ 23,000 | \$ 22,008 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 5,051 | \$ 40,813 | \$ 45,098 | \$ (4,285) |
| Post-mission | 1.69 | 0.61 | \$ 5,700 | \$ 3,049 | \$ 9,610 | \$ 1,860 | \$ - | \$ 5,077 | \$ 21,400 | \$ 21,421 | \$ 31,010 | \$ 28,357 | \$ 2,653 |
| Central Unit Costs | | | | | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ 7,000 | \$ 7,000 | \$ - |
| Sub-Total | 5.62 | 5.77 | \$ 6,586 | \$ 6,513 | \$ 37,010 | \$ 37,580 | \$ 23,000 | \$ 27,084 | \$ 31,400 | \$ 31,471 | \$ 91,410 | \$ 96,136 | \$ (4,726) |