

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project “Improvement of the decision-making process in Kazakhstan through introduction of mechanisms of economic assessment of fulfilling national obligations under global environmental agreements» (CB2), PIMS #5248

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<b>Project title</b>	“Improvement of the decision-making process in Kazakhstan through introduction of mechanisms of economic assessment of fulfilling national obligations under global environmental agreements» (CB2)			
GEF Project ID:	5399		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	UNDP PMS #5248 Project ID #00090945	GEF financing:	500.000 (grant)	500.000 (grant)
Country:	Kazakhstan	IA/EA own:	50.000 (in-kind)	50.000 (in-kind)
Region:	ECIS	Government:	600.000 (in-kind)	600.000 (in-kind)
Focal Area:	Multi-Focal Area	Other :		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2	Total co-financing:	650.000	650.000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Agriculture of Kazakhstan, Ministry of Finance of Kazakhstan	Total Project Cost:	1.150.000	1.150.000
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		16 Sept. 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 16 Sept. 2017	Actual: 16 Sept. 2017

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to be complementary to other related projects under implementation in Kazakhstan, in particular those supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to ensure non-

duplication of GEF grants. Careful attention has been given to coordinating project activities in such a way that activities are mutually supportive and opportunities capitalized to realize synergies and cost-effectiveness.

The goal of this project is to put in place new approaches that will facilitate better development decisions for the global environment. To that end, the project objective has been to undertake a targeted set of activities to develop technical and institutional capacities for undertaking an economic valuation of global environmental goods and services as potentially impacted by proposed development policies, programmes, plans and projects. Specifically, the project has developed natural resource valuation tools for valuing global environmental benefits; provided training and learn-by-doing exercises on their use; and helped institutionalize natural resource valuation. The expected outcomes of this project are: (1) Decisions to protect the global environment are better enabled and (2) Technical and management staff sufficiently trained in the use and application of natural resource valuation tools, and decision-makers fully aware of natural resource valuation tools.

This project is structured into two inter-linked components. The first component focuses on the development of the natural resource valuation tools and providing training on how to use these tools for improved planning and decisions to meet global environmental objectives. The second component focuses on the institutionalization of natural resource valuation to ensure that they continue to be used over the long-term. Activities under this component has included testing the use of natural resource valuation tools and facilitating the legislative and institutional reforms necessary for their long-term use.

The total project budget is USD 1.150.000. The allocated resources including the co-financing amount are as follows:

- GEF USD 1,758,182
- Government of Kazakhstan USD 600.000 (in-kind)
- UNDP USD 50.000 (in-kind)

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a mission **to Astana and Almaty cities, Kazakhstan** ([Annex H](#)).

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

Interviews will be held with the following personnel and organizations:

- 1) UNDP CO representatives;
- 2) Project team;
- 3) Representative of Government, including:
  - Forestry and Wildlife Committee Ministry of Agriculture of Kazakhstan;
  - Ministry of finance of Kazakhstan;
- 4) Representative of private sector including:
  - Kazakh National Agrarian University;
  - Kazakh Research Institute of Fishery;
  - Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity oh Kazakhstan;
  - Other experts

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including **Inception report, annual project progress reports, project budget revisions, GEF focal area tracking tools – CD Scorecards, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials** that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([Annex A](#)) which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

---

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support	50.000	50.000	600.000	600.000			650.000	650.000
• Other								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>50.000</b>	<b>50.000</b>	<b>600.000</b>	<b>600.000</b>			<b>650.000</b>	<b>650.000</b>

## MAINSTREAMING

---

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programs. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

---

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

---

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kazakhstan. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

---

The total duration of the evaluation will be **18 days** according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	3 working days	10 October 2017
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	5 working days	7-11 November 2017
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	5 working days	24 November 2017
<b>Final Report</b>	5 working days	8 December 2017

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission 11 November 2017	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	24 November 2017	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	8 December 2017	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation will be conducting by 1 (one) international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Master degree in environmental, biodiversity, development, social sciences and/or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported multi-focal area capacity development projects (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in biodiversity and environmental sectors (20%)
- Excellent written English (20%)

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- 1) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP<sup>1</sup>;
- 2) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form);
- 3) Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- 4) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template;
- 5) 3 recommendations from previous customers.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

COA (MUST BE INDICATORS IN NUMBERS)							
Project ID	Activity	Account	Sum	Fund	ID Dep	Impl. Agency	Donor
00090945	Activity 3	71200		30071	55205	001101	00142
Total:							

**APPROVED:**

---

**Talgat Kerteshev**

Project Manager, UNDP Biodiversity projects

\_\_\_\_\_

signature                      date

**Victoria Baigazina**

Programme Associate, Sustainable  
Development and Urbanization Unit

\_\_\_\_\_

signature                      date

**Rassul Rakhimov**

Programme Analyst, Sustainable Development  
and Urbanization Unit

\_\_\_\_\_

signature                      date

**Zhanetta Babasheva**

Resources Monitoring Associate, Strategic  
Support Unit

\_\_\_\_\_

signature                      date

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<b>Long-term goal: To put in place new approaches that will facilitate better development decisions for the global environment</b>					
<p><b>Project objectives:</b></p> <p><b>To develop technical and institutional capacities for undertaking an economic valuation of global environmental goods and services as potentially impacted by proposed development policies, programmes, plans and projects.</b></p>	<p><b>Outcome indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Decisions to protect the global environment are better enabled</li> <li>▪ Technical and management staff sufficiently trained in the use and application of natural resource valuation tools, and decision-makers fully aware of natural resource valuation tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is high-level support and parliamentary approval for the Green Economy concept in Kazakhstan</li> <li>▪ Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in development planning</li> <li>▪ Institutional capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is piecemeal and takes place through Rio Convention-specific projects, with development emphasizing socio-economic priorities</li> <li>▪ Planners and decision-makers, particularly at the local level do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions and the use of net present value to determine value leads to heavy discounting of the global environment</li> </ul>	<p><b>By the end of the project:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Government staff have learned, applied, and tested best practice tools to integrate natural resource valuation into national decision-making processes for improved implementation of Rio Conventions</li> <li>▪ Future planning and development will account for the true value of environmental goods and services</li> <li>▪ Increased capacity within relevant stakeholder groups to address Rio Convention obligations</li> <li>▪ Gender equality targets per UNDP 2013-2017 Strategic Plan are met</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting Minutes<sup>3</sup></li> <li>▪ Working Group meeting reports</li> <li>▪ UNDP quarterly progress reports</li> <li>▪ Independent final evaluation reports</li> <li>▪ Rio Convention national reports and communications</li> <li>▪ Strategic documents detailing the new valuation tools</li> <li>▪ GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner</li> <li>▪ Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible</li> <li>▪ Improving the valuation process will help decision-making relating to the global environment become more inclusive, legitimate, and robust</li> <li>▪ Planners and decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes towards the global environment</li> <li>▪ Government agencies may see natural resource</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.



Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
					<p>valuation as an additional burden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Insufficient technical skills within a variety of related institutions that may not be easily trainable in the full appreciation and interpretation of natural resource valuation tools, technics and data.</li> <li>▪ The project is taking a “learning by doing” approach, which requires quick response to newly appearing challenges and adaptive management of the project.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 1: Decisions to protect the global environment are better enabled</b>					
<b>Output 1.1</b> <b>Development of natural resource valuation tools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report on natural resource valuation</li> <li>▪ Natural resource valuation tools</li> <li>▪ Expert working group meetings</li> <li>▪ Integration of valuation tools into</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Planners and decision-makers do not incorporate full value of ecosystem goods and services</li> <li>▪ Evidence of public sector staff’s technical capacities related to the Rio Conventions is limited</li> <li>▪ Despite expressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Natural resource valuation report drafted by month 4 and peer-reviewed, finalized and presented by month 5</li> <li>▪ Valuation tools developed and peer-reviewed by month 7, endorsed by Government by month 9, and revised during piloting phase in year 2, and finalized by month 30</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting minutes</li> <li>▪ Tracking and progress reports<sup>4</sup></li> <li>▪ Natural resource valuation tools and report</li> <li>▪ Letter of endorsement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reports and analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives</li> <li>▪ Members of the working group will be comprised of proactive experts and</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Tracking and progress reports include UNDP Quarterly Reports, Annual Performance Reports, and Project Implementation Reports. Each output will be tracked by a report that records the activities and milestones of each output using tools such as Gantt or PERT charts.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	decision-making	government commitment to the global environment, several issues undermine policies and efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expert working group convened by month 3</li> <li>▪ An agreement to utilize natural resource valuation tools in decision-making signed by month 12</li> </ul>		<p>project champions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutions and working groups are open to proposed agreements and there is no active institutional resistance</li> <li>▪ Enabling policy and legislation in place to support the signing of an appropriate agreement</li> <li>▪ Institutions follow through on commitments under an appropriate agreement</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.2: Training of technical capacities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NRV training materials and curriculum</li> <li>▪ Sensitization workshops on NRV for government decision-makers, private sector, and NGOs</li> <li>▪ NRV training courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a lack of capacity among agency staff and less than optimal understanding of natural resource valuation</li> <li>▪ NRV guidelines and tools are not widely known among planners and decision-makers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Materials and curriculum developed and peer-reviewed by month 12, revised following piloting by month 24, and again by month 30 after NRV mainstreaming and reforms</li> <li>▪ At least six workshops convened, the first by month 9 and the last by month 30</li> <li>▪ Workshops will have a total of at least 150 different stakeholders including at least 50 senior decision-makers and planners</li> <li>▪ Training courses begin by month 13 and end by month 16</li> <li>▪ No fewer than 200 government staff will have participated in courses and average test score of at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting minutes</li> <li>▪ Tracking and progress reports</li> <li>▪ Training materials and curriculum</li> <li>▪ Participant registration lists</li> <li>▪ Workshop reports</li> <li>▪ Test scores</li> <li>▪ Feedback from training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expert peer-reviews are thorough and of high quality</li> <li>▪ Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all trainings</li> <li>▪ The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activities</li> <li>▪ Trainers will agree with best practices to mainstream and implement training based on the Rio Conventions</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
			least 80%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other training programmes and curricula do not work against Rio Conventions</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 2: Technical and management staff trained in the use and application of NRV tools, and decision-makers fully aware of NRV tools</b>					
<b>Output 2.1:</b> <b>Mainstreaming natural resource valuation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for high-value development project to pilot NRV tools</li> <li>Stakeholder workshop to select development project for piloting</li> <li>Workshops to evaluate pilot project and feedback surveys from attendees</li> <li>Pilot project evaluation and report on best practices and lessons learned</li> <li>Awareness-raising brochures prepared from report</li> <li>Sectoral screening workshops</li> <li>Guidelines and methodologies for application of NRV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a shortage of technical capacity amongst planners at all levels to utilize information and knowledge related to the value of ecosystem goods and services, and to mainstream it into the planning processes</li> <li>Civil society stakeholders have limited experience with participation in the economic arena, and few CSOs have the necessary technical and administrative capacities to operate effectively in Kazakhstan</li> <li>Kazakhstan will host the International Exposition (Expo 2017) in June 2017, the central theme of which is innovative and practical energy solutions. This will be an opportunity to showcase its lessons learned in pursuing green economy, and project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria approved by Project Board by month 14</li> <li>Workshop convened by month 16 with at least 50 representative from private sector and NGOs, project for NRV piloting selected by month 17</li> <li>Six workshops with at least 100 staff and stakeholder representatives convened by month 22</li> <li>90% response rate for workshop feedback surveys by month 22, and statistical analysis of evaluations by month 23</li> <li>Best practices and lessons learned report from workshops drafted by month 24, peer-reviewed by month 26, and finalized by month 28</li> <li>500 brochures available for distribution at Expo 2017</li> <li>Five sectoral screening workshops with at least 250 key government staff and representatives by month 30</li> <li>Guidelines and methodologies for NRV drafted by month 28, peer-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting minutes</li> <li>Tracking and progress reports</li> <li>Participation lists</li> <li>Workshop reports</li> <li>Feedback surveys</li> <li>Statistical analyses</li> <li>Best practices and lessons learned report</li> <li>Awareness raising brochures</li> <li>NRV guidelines and methodologies</li> <li>Letter of endorsement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshop participants contribute their honest attitudes and values</li> <li>Regional and non-state stakeholder representation in project activities legitimately reflect their stakeholder constituent views and priorities</li> <li>Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</li> <li>Planners and decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes towards the global environment</li> <li>Brochures will be read and the content absorbed</li> <li>Report will be read and valued by target recipients</li> <li>There is sufficient</li> </ul>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		activities	reviewed and finalized by month 31, and officially endorsed by month 32		commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support to project activities
<b>Output 2.2: Legislative and institutional reforms</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutional and legislative assessment</li> <li>▪ Bills for institutional and legislative reforms</li> <li>▪ Resource mobilization strategy for long-term financial needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some political reforms are already on-going including a draft Law on Local Governance that is designed to strengthen capacities of local communities to monitor local state budget spending, and encourage development of multi-stakeholder public and local community entities that can engage with the local and sub-regional authorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutional and legislative assessment drafted by month 9, revised by month 26, and finalized by month 28</li> <li>▪ Expert working groups validate expert analysis on NRV institutionalization by month 12 and institutional and legislative assessments by month 30. Group meets three times in year 2 for project updates.</li> <li>▪ Bills for reforms drafted by month 30, peer-reviewed, validated and submitted for Parliamentary approval by month 33</li> <li>▪ Expert working group convened by month 13 to draft resource mobilization strategy by month 21, strategy reviewed and finalized by month 25 and approved by month 28</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting minutes</li> <li>▪ Tracking and progress reports</li> <li>▪ Institutional and legislative assessment and bills for reforms</li> <li>▪ Peer-review comments</li> <li>▪ Resource mobilization strategy</li> <li>▪ Letter of approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Best practices and lessons learned are applicable in Kazakhstan and appropriately used</li> <li>▪ Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</li> <li>▪ Legislative and institutional reforms recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible</li> </ul>

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

- 1) Project document
- 2) Inception report
- 1) Project implementation plan
- 2) Project budget and financial data
- 3) Annual project Implementation reports
- 4) Reports of consultants
- 5) Information of pilot areas
- 6) Resolution of the meetings of the Steering Committee
- 7) List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project relevant to CBD and other international convention objectives?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project relevant the GEF Mullti focal area (biodiversity and climate change)?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project relevant to Kazakhstan’s environment and sustainable development objectives?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project internally coherent in its design?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>			
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>			
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was project support provided in an efficient way?☒</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> </ul>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed?</li> </ul>			
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?</li> </ul>			

**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

<p><b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		



## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. Evaluator should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluator must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluator are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluator should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Must be sensitive to beliefs, customs and customs and act honestly and honestly in their dealings with all interested parties. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluator must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. Evaluator should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). Evaluator are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>5</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>5</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>6</sup>

---

- i.** Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>7</sup>)
- 1.** Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>8</sup>)
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

---

<sup>6</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>7</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>8</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

### 3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

## 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

## 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H.

### Agenda of Evaluator's mission

#### Participants:

- 1) CB2 project team and consultants in Kazakhstan
- 2) UNDP CO in Kazakhstan
- 3) Government authorities
- 4) Other project partners

**Venue of review:** Astana, Almaty Kazakhstan

**Period of review:** 5 days, including arrival and departure dates

#### Agenda of visits and meetings:

1 <sup>st</sup> day	<b>Arrival to Astana</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> day	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Meeting with project team and reviewing the evaluation process<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Review of monitoring goals and objectives</li><li>▪ Review of the CB2 Project implementation in Kazakhstan</li></ul></li><li>2) Visit to the Pavilion of EXPO-2017</li></ol>
3 <sup>rd</sup> day	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Meeting with the Forestry and Wildlife Committee of Ministry of Agriculture representatives</li><li>2) Meeting with representative of the Ministry of Finance</li><li>3) Meeting with the UNDP representatives</li><li><b>4) Arrival to Almaty</b></li></ol>
4 <sup>th</sup> day	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Meeting with the Kazakh National Agrarian University, Kazakh Research Institute of Fishery, Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity oh Kazakhstan representatives and other consultants</li><li>2) Meeting with project team<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Summarizing, discussing, recommending, providing prior monitoring review</li></ul></li></ol>
5 <sup>th</sup> day	<b>Departure from Almaty</b>