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

1. Reporting MDB	IFC
2. Mission Details:	
• Country	Turkey
MDBs Involved	IBRD, IFC, EBRD
Mission Co-Leader	
Mission Dates	
Mission Category	Joint public / private
<ul> <li>Total number of Staff Weeks Budgeted</li> </ul>	3
Budget Endorsed by MDB Committee	Yes
TFC Review Date	

## 3. Manpower Input – Actual vs. Budgeted (fill out attached Table 1 and summarize here any significant differences in actual vs. budgeted staff-weeks inputs)

Three staff weeks were originally budgeted for the Turkey CIP. This consisted of time from the Team Leader in the field, other local team members, the CTF coordinator and the country manager. Because none of the IFC staff members charged their time to the CIP, it is difficult to say how much time was actually spent on IFC's contributions to the project. The team has estimated the time spent to be approximately 14.25 days or approximately 3 weeks developing IFC's contributions to the CIP.

In the first three joint missions, IFC did not track costs pre, post and for the joint mission. As a result it is difficult to say where most of the staff time was spent.

## 4. Mission Costs Charged to CTF – Actual vs. Budgeted (fill out attached Table 2 and explain here briefly any significant differences between actual vs. budgeted)

One within country trip was budgeted and one trip was taken. The budget variance is \$785. This is because the team member did not stay in a hotel but flew back and forth each day (the charges for flying were cheaper than the hotel and incidental costs).

# 5. Mission Cost Sharing (summarize opportunity for and extent of sharing mission cost with non-CTF MDB activities)

Local IFC staff working on the CIP did not charge their time to the project. This meant that actual expenditures charged to the CTF were \$902 compared to the budget if \$18,600.

#### 6. Lessons Learned:

a. Pre-mission Preparation (e.g. extent, adequacy, importance)

Record keeping needs to track expenses at the pre, post and during mission stage. IFC has changed its recording system to be able to track expenses in such detail.

If staff do not charge their time to charge codes, it is difficult to know exactly how much time was spent on developing the CTF compared to how much is being charged. We need to acknowledge that this will be a best guess after the fact.

### b. MDB Coordination (including pre and post mission)

The IFC team felt that the mission worked well and there was good coordination among the MDBs. It helped having one MDB team leader and focal point (IBRD in this case).

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

This was managed by IBRD and worked well.

d. Coordination with UN Agencies and Bilateral and Other Multilateral donors (extent of participation in mission work, scope and consultations)

This was managed by IBRD and worked well.

e. Involvement of NGOs and Greater Civil Society in IP Preparation Process (nature and scope of participation/consultation)

This was managed by IBRD and worked well.

f. Other Aspects of Mission Work

None.

g. Additional Comments or Suggestions for Enhancement of Joint Mission Process

These missions, out of necessity, were completed in a very short time frame. This did not leave enough "thinking and assessing" time for the private sector (and perhaps even public sector) players to properly identify opportunities. As a result some flexibility should be given to amend CIPs, if more effective opportunities are identified in the coming months.

Table 1. Post Mission Summary of Mission Members' Contribution to IP
Preparation

Mission Member	Summary of Contributions/Inputs to IP
IFC	
1. Temel Oktem, Investment Officer (IFC Team Leader)	2 days pre-mission     Half day coordination meeting with IBRD and EBRD
Team Leader)	<ul> <li>internal coordination with investment officers and research on high potential investment opportunities for GHG impact</li> </ul>
	3 days mission     2 days of meetings with various government and private sector stakeholders plus one day of
	additional internal coordination and drafting of ideas  3 days post-mission  • Prepared the initial draft of the
	Private Sector Annex (which originally focused on energy efficiency); further coordination with EBRD on private sector opportunities and redrafting of the Annex including incorporation of additional components on renewable
	energy which were drafted by EBRD; further internal coordination  • Provided comments on overall document and on other project components
2. Kudret Akgun, Sr. Investment Officer	Half day coordination meeting with IBRD and EBRD plus internal coordination with investment officers and research on high potential investment opportunities for GHG impact
'	1 day mission  • additional internal coordination and drafting of ideas; support to IFC CTF team leader
	3 days post-mission  • provided inputs to the initial draft of

	the Private Sector Annex (which originally focused on energy efficiency); further coordination with EBRD on private sector opportunities and redrafting of the Annex including incorporation of additional components on renewable energy which were drafted by EBRD; further internal coordination  • Provided comments on overall document and on other project components
3. Morgan Landy, IFC Country Manager for Turkey	<ul> <li>4/2 day pre-mission         <ul> <li>Half day coordination meeting with IBRD and EBRD</li> <li>4/4 day post-mission</li> <li>Provided guidance to the IFC team and inputs into to the investment proposals</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2. Lisa Da Silva, Sr. Investment Officer	Coordinated internal stakeholders and MDB committee; brainstormed with team and shared ideas on potential CTF opportunities and how IFC could play a role      day post-mission     Reviewed documentation and provided comments

Table 2. Post-Joint Mission Summary of Staff Week Inputs

1	MDB	W.	Team Members Total Number of Staff Weeks B A B A	Total N	Vumber of	Staff Weeks	s Average	age Staff	Staff Week Rate of Team	of Team	nary or o	otal Staff W	Average Staff Week Rate of Team Total Staff Week Costs Mission Travel & Subsistence Co	and Cos	S (B=Bu Mission	Idgeted, Travel & St	i (B=Budgeted, A=Actual) Mission Travel & Subsistence Costs	l) Costs		TOTAL			Difference Between Budget	een Budgel
B	Pre-Mission	- ~ .	- 24	2		¢				4	0	_	4		80		4		en .		4		Total and Act	ual Total
B	Mission	2 + 0	n - a																					
State A	Post-Mission	n + n	n − u																					
B	Sub-Total	673	e																					
14					0		0		100		The same	0		0				0	-8	•		10.5		
March Agents   Marc	2			m		×		100					112							•		0		
1970   1970	Te-Mission		207		0.0						0		4	0	8		4		8		4	35		
Tener Option   Color		Morgan Land			00	•		570	9 6	5700		570		0						570		00		
Single Landy         OLD Single Landy	Mission	Ternel Oktem			9 0 0	o'	70	570	00	5700		1140		411		1600				1140		114		
Temporary Temporary Colored String		Morgan Landy			0.7			570	0.0	5700		1140				000		715		1140		715		
Street Akguin	ost-Mission				0 6		0	570	c.	5700		9 0		0						570		0		
Use Silva Lisa Da Silva 3 0.013 5700 5700 1140 74.1 1500 715 1280 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Kudnet Akgun			0.4			3076		5700		4560		0						4560		00		
1140 74,1 1500 715 1140 74,1 1500 715 1140 74,1 1500 715 1140 74,1 1140 74,1 1140 74,1 1140 74,1 1140 74,1 17860 901,1 17860 901,1 17860 901,1 17860		Lisa Da Silva			0 0	00	1.3	5700		5700		0		0						2280		0 (		
B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B B B A B B B A B B B A B B B A B B B A B B B A B B B A B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B A B B B B B B A B	ab-Total				P	0.0		5	A CONTRACT	2700	SALTER.	17100		188.1		1500				1140		74.1		
2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 3 2 2 3	RDB Pre-Mission		۷,	0		4			*		8		٨							18600		903.1		
3 3 0.033 17190 17886	Mission	- M M - M	- (N IN (												2		4		CO.		⋖			
3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	st-Mission	1n-N	v # + 01																					
3 0,033 17100 171890 188.1 18800 715 18800 903.1 171898	b-Total	n	n		•		0				V	0	100	0		•								
	and Total	4			3	0.03	22	A				17100		188.1		1500		715		18600		903.1		17696

17696.9