

**GBEP Working Group on Capacity Building
for Sustainable Bioenergy**

ACTIVITY GROUP 2

***Raising awareness and sharing of data and experiences from the
implementation of the GBEP indicators***

**Proposal on a framework for evaluating the GBEP indicator implementation
projects**

Draft 11 February 2013

Introduction

The main objective of the Activity Group 2 is to learn from the experience of using the indicators in the field. It will share this knowledge and information within the Working Group on Capacity Building in order to overcome problems, find solutions and improve the methodological application of the indicators. Moreover, adequate information sharing during testing should also help secure a common interpretation of the indicators.

In the coming months the GBEP indicators will be tested in different countries with different circumstances in climate, biodiversity, social and economic conditions. As different as the country circumstances are as different are the projects' objectives: in some countries indicator evaluation pilot projects will emphasize the applicability of the indicators to country-specific circumstances. In other countries indicator pilot projects will lead to assessing and enhancing the capacity of these countries to use the indicators and to develop bioenergy policies. In these countries, indicator evaluation pilot projects will also test the feasibility and usefulness of the indicators.

In order to support the learning process and to facilitate formulating common lessons learned, a questionnaire for project evaluation is suggested. The questions are differentiated into those that evaluate the process of indicator implementation and those that shall help to evaluate the indicators themselves. The questionnaire shall build a framework that allows to better share and compare views and suggestions on the indicators.

The questionnaire can be used in a twofold way:

1. First, they can be distributed before an indicator implementation project gets started. In this phase, especially the questions on approach and procedure shall help to reflect on the project set-up.
2. Second, the questions shall help to evaluate indicator implementation projects after they have been finalized.

Questions on approach and procedures

1. What was the objective of the project?
2. Were all indicators assessed? If not, what have been the criteria for omitting certain indicators?
3. Was the whole bioenergy sector taken into account? If not, what were the reasons to choose the pathways assessed?
4. Which approach was chosen and which action were taken for the assessment (e.g. case studies, national surveys, desktop study, workshops)? What are the reasons for the choice?
5. Which difficulties arose with the selected approach? How have they been dealt with? What went well with the approach?
6. How work intensive was the project in the pilot phase?
7. Was the workload an obstacle for assessing the indicators? If yes, in which way have you dealt with the problem?
8. Was the situation in terms of data availability an obstacle for assessing the indicators? If yes, how was the problem dealt with?
9. Which stakeholders were involved (e.g. ministries, science, NGOs)?
10. What experiences have you made regarding the cooperation with relevant ministries? What advice do you have for improving the communication with and between relevant ministries?
11. Do you think that the indicators are useful to improve the bioenergy policy in your country? Were you able to formulate feedback to politically relevant bodies in order to increase the sustainability of bioenergy production?
12. Which actions will be taken in the follow-up of the project (e.g. collect more data on certain indicators, implementing a monitoring system)? Who is taking the lead in these actions?

Questions on the indicators' content

1. Do the indicators address all sustainability aspects you consider as relevant in your country? If not, what is missing?
2. Is there already a monitoring system in place for some of the indicators? For which?
3. For each indicator: could it be applied in the way it is described in the methodology sheets? Which suggestions for improvement do you have?
4. Were the methodology description clear and detailed enough? Could you apply the methods described? Do you have any feedback on the methodology sheets (additions, alternative methods,...)?
5. Were you able to establish the link between indicator values / changes in values and bioenergy production and use? If not, do you have any suggestions for improvement?