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|  | 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY   This document refers to the findings of the Mid Term Review Mission of the project entitled “Generate Global Environmental Benefits through Environmental Education and Training of Stakeholders”, that was fielded from 24 November 2017 to 01 December 2017 in Yerevan, Republic of Armenia, - hereafter called the Mission-.  This MTR Report incorporates responses to the comments of the UNDP Office in Yerevan on the Draft MTR Report submitted on December 17, 2017.    1.1. Project Description  This Project is in line with the following CCCD Programme Objectives:   * CD2 - to generate, access and use information and knowledge; and * CD4 - to strengthen capacities for management and implementation   on convention guidelines.    It is also aligned with the second and third objective of the GEF-6 CCCD strategy that is to:   * strengthen consultative and management structures and mechanisms; and, * integrate MEAs provisions within national policy, legislative, and regulatory frameworks.     Furthermore, it is a direct response to the GEF-funded National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) project conducted in Armenia during the period of 2003-2004 and particularly a direct response to a governmental measure that was calling for the “*organization of continuous education and awareness raising activities for the public on issues related to Conventions. Develop and implement educational projects on the elaboration of the local environmental projects, methods and activities of sustainable use of natural resources for local self-administration bodies*”.  Through a learning-by-doing process, this project is expected to strengthen the capacities of key individuals and institutions to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools. By extension, better environmental skills and knowledge will be available in Armenia, which should in turn deliver greater global environmental achievements over the medium and long-term.  The first component will address capacity gaps of the existing enabling environment that is preventing environmental education of being effectively used as a tool by stakeholders involved in natural resource management.  The second component will be used to mainstream environmental education into national strategies, programmes and projects, and also to develop environmental education programmes as well as sustainable delivery mechanisms targeting staff in the public sector and educators in Armenia.  Finally, the third component will be used to develop the capacity of CBOs and of the media – including journalists - to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for conducting information awareness and environmental education activities at the community level but also at the national level through a national campaign.  1.2. Project progress summary  Considerable efforts by the Government of Armenia, some with the support of externally funded projects, have been made in the past, and continue to be made in education and awareness building in the field of nature conservation, the sustainable use of natural resources for local self-administration bodies etc..  At the time of the Mission, a number of projects were ongoing in the above fields, while additional activities and programs were under preparation.  A close coordination and cooperation among these activities is highly advisable, as it will contribute towards synergy, enhanced effectiveness and efficiency of the various efforts and a better awareness across the board.  The Project Document of the project under review was endorsed on 05 May 2015. The LPAC was held on June 10, 2015 and the Project Document was signed on November 3rd 2015, for the duration of 3 years.  The Project is implemented by UNDP under Support to National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Project implementing agency is the Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP).The Ministry of Education and Science is the main Project Beneficiary.  A Project Management Unit (PMU) is set up at the UNDP Office in Yerevan. UNDP acts as the GEF Agency for the Project.  The establishment of the Project Board, co-chaired by the UNDP in Armenia and the RoA MNP, was completed, comprised of nominated representatives from the key stakeholder Ministries: i) the RoA Ministry of Nature Protection, and ii) the RoA Ministry of Science and Education. The establishment of multi-stakeholder Advisory Committee was also completed.  Although the project started with some delay, the implementation of the planned activities went on in an accelerated mode at the time of the Mission.  The Project has hired a good number of consultants in the various fields that are relevant to the project outcomes and cover legal, policy and institutional/capacity assessments, the assessment of the training needs of government institutions and CBO’s, the development of training materials, the development of a national strategy on environmental education and training, etc.  The Project Document lists 25 stakeholders with their anticipated roles in the Project. The Inception Workshop, which in fact was an informative launching ceremony, did not clarify the specific responsibilities and roles of the various stakeholders, see #4.  The Inception Report reproduced the table with the stakeholders and their anticipated role, which was included in the Project Document.  The Mission feels, based on the numerous consultations, that the roles of the various stakeholders in the implementation of the programme were insufficiently defined, and with merely one year to go, the Project will have to carefully plan with relevant authorities, the delivery of all prepared training materials in order to proceed in a well agreed upon and structured manner.  For that matter, a clear definition of the stakeholders’ mandates and responsibilities in the various fields of the Project implementation will be crucial in order to achieve the Project Objective.  This will also positively enhance the institutional adjustments that the project is expected to support, as well as the effectiveness of all training that is to be delivered.  1.3. MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |  | | | **Progress Towards Results** | Objective  Ach. Rating: 4 | There is no mid term target. Consultant reports provide useful information | | | Outcome1 Ach. Rating: 4 | No mid term target. Consultant reports provide useful information. Key factor here is adoption/enforcement of suggested legal amendments. | | | Outcome2 Ach. Rating: 4 | No mid term target. Consultant reports provide useful information | | | Outcome3 Ach. Rating: 4 | No mid term target. Consultant reports provide useful information | | |  | | **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | Rating: 3 | The Project is poorly embedded in the relevant government structures, which leads to a poor level of participation, ownership, institutionalisation and enforcement of the anticipated outcomes. | | | **Sustainability** | Rating : 3 | Likely low level of sustainability due to the relatively low level of ownership and self involvement of key agencies. | |   1.4. Concise Summary and Conclusions  Considerable efforts by the Government of Armenia, with support of a series of projects, have been made in the past, and continue to be made in education and awareness building in the field of nature conservation and environmental management.  The Project started on 03 November 2015, for a duration of 3 years. The Project Inception Workshop took place on June 24, 2016. The Project Technical Task Leader came on board on August 01, 2016.  The MTR Mission took place from November 24 to December 1th , 2017.    While the Project Document may not give the impression, the scope of this Project is relatively vast, given the institutional complexity. The logical framework includes matters such as policy, legal, institutional, and capacity adjustments, as well as the delivery of a vast training program. To deliver such objectives in a three year timeframe is a challenge, unless a clear definition of mandates and responsibilities has been well established from the onset of the project.  The achievement of all goals and outcomes requires thorough insights, analyses and assessments, and necessary agreements among all stakeholders in order to derive at an implementation of all proposed adjustments and, equally important, the structured coherent delivery of all training programs in an effective, efficient and a sustainable manner.  Also the above reasons, a solid ownership and participation are key to the swift endorsement and institutionalisation of the outputs of the project.  The project has fielded a good number of consultancies, local and international.  Discussions with Project Stakeholders revealed that one of the major issues the implementation of training programs is likely to encounter is related to the fact that there appears to be an unclear division/definition of the responsibilities among stakeholders when it comes to “who does what” in the field of environmental training. (See Analyses under #4).  Necessary training needs assessments have been completed, preparations are under way for the actual implementation of the training programs.  The strategy for the delivery of the training is being prepared and is expected to be completed in the near future.  The Project, with the support of stakeholders and consultants, has undertaken useful assessments of the training needs, and at the time of the mission was working on the necessary strategies for the delivery of the training programs.    Several major stakeholders felt that the vast sector of “environmental education and training” needed some redefined organisation and that a thorough analyses of “who does what” in the environmental education sector, in particular in the adult training sector was needed.  Defining and entrusting clear responsibilities of the variety of stakeholders currently involved in environmental education, in its broader sense, will require a great deal of coordination, possibly the setting up of an inter ministerial platform that is to handle this delicate, yet urgent matter.  1.5. Recommendations  Considerable efforts, by the Government of Armenia, some with support of external funding, have been carried out, and continue to be carried out at the time of the Mission.  A number of externally funded projects appear to be in the pipeline (e.g. World Bank, European Commission), or are ongoing (e.g. GIZ).  Close consultation with these agencies will result in higher synergy, efficiency and effectiveness. It is suggested to include some of these agencies into the Project Action Committee. See #4.  Some agencies felt they were insufficiently consulted/involved in the Project’s analytical activities. In order to enhance government ownership, the sustainability of the program, and a close involvement of the Government Stakeholders in the project activities is crucial.  As the Project has less than a year to go, the Mission recommends that the Project prepares soonest, with the stakeholders, a detailed plan that contains all uncompleted issues and tasks in each of the Project Outcomes. On the basis of this “to do list” a clear roadmap should be prepared for the coordinated delivery of the plan.  Before the start of the implementation of the education/training activities based on above analyses, the participating parties, training providers and recipient entities, with the help of the Project, should clearly define the implementation ways, modalities and responsibilities i.e. the clear definition of the role and responsibilities of the various institutions that are to be involved in the various aspects of the programme.  The Mission suggests that to this effect, a well moderated workshop be organised in which all stakeholders and training providers participate.  The above efforts are crucial in order to optimize the effectiveness, the efficiency and the sustainability of the entire program, and to prepare the relevant entities to sustain the past and present efforts in the sector. | | | |
| 222. | | 2. INTRODUCTION  2.1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives  The purpose of the MTR is to assess the progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR reviewed the project’s strategy, and its risks to sustainability.  2.2. Scope and Methodology  The Mission gathered evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The Mission reviewed all relevant sources of information including PIF documentation, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, the Project Progress Reports, and a great number of other materials the Mission considered useful for this evidence-based review.  The Mission followed a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts and stakeholders, the relevant offices within the UNDP Country Office, and most consultants involved in the Project.  Contacts were also made with other donors who have activities in the broad field of the Project.  Interviews with all Project stakeholders who have project responsibilities were undertaken.    The Mission report describes the full review approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.  The Mission reviewed the problems addressed by the Project and the underlying assumptions and the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.  The Mission also reviewed the relevance of the project strategy and assessed whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design? Relevant Projects involving other donors were visited.  The Mission also reviewed how the project addressed country priorities, the country’s ownership, the national sector development priorities and plans of the country, as well as the decision-making processes.  Issues of concern were highlighted.  A critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets was made with the Project’s TTL.  The scores are presented in a separate document included in the Annexes to this Report (Annex 6.2.) | | | | | |
|  | 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION  3.1. Development context  This Project is in line with the following CCCD Programme Objectives:   * CD2 - to generate, access and use information and knowledge; and * CD4 - to strengthen capacities for management and implementation   on convention guidelines.    It is also aligned with the second and third objective of the GEF-6 CCCD strategy that is to:   * strengthen consultative and management structures and mechanisms; and, * integrate MEAs provisions within national policy, legislative, and regulatory frameworks.     Furthermore, it is a direct response to the GEF-funded National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) project conducted in Armenia during the period of 2003-2004 and particularly a direct response to a governmental measure that was calling for the “*organization of continuous education and awareness raising activities for the public on issues related to Conventions. Develop and implement educational projects on the elaboration of the local environmental projects, methods and activities of sustainable use of natural resources for local self-administration bodies*”.  3.2. Problems that the Project seeks to address  Armenia is fully committed to meet its obligations under the MEAs that it is a Party to. Among these obligations, there are capacity development needs that are required for Parties to be able to implement the Rio Conventions nationally and contribute to global environmental benefits.  The Project is intended to expand the capacity of Armenia to generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders to implement the Rio Convention strategies.  3.3. Problems description and strategy  The Project is to strengthen the capacity to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resource management issues. By developing the capacity of stakeholders, the project is expected to address several shared obligations under the three Rio Conventions, which call for countries to strengthen their national capacities for effective national environmental management systems..  As a result, it will improve the capacity to engage stakeholders in environmental management, to make use of pertinent environmental information to understand global environmental issues and solutions, to improve environmental policy-making, and to some extend improve the monitoring of the environment.  The project has three components (outcomes), each with a number of outputs, as outlined below.  b xxx  **Componen Component 1: Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholder as natural resource management tools.**  Under this outcome, the project is to address the capacity gaps of the existing enabling environment (policy, legislation and institutional frameworks) that is preventing environmental education being effectively used as a tool by stakeholders involved in natural resource management. The project has to review existing frameworks, identify the capacity gaps and needs and based on the findings address those priority capacity needs. The expected result from this outcome is an institutionalized enabling environment that is conducive to the development and implementation of sustainable environmental education programmes in Armenia and the staff in public sector entities knowledgeable about this improved enabling environment.  Component 1 is expected to have the following outputs:  **Output 1.1: Adequate legislation and policy frameworks are in place to implement obligations from the Rio and Aarhus Conventions related to environmental education and public awareness**    This output is to provide Armenia with the necessary enabling policy and legal instruments for the development and implementation of sustainable environmental education programmes. Project supported activities will include a review of the legislation and policies related to environmental education and public awareness. Based on this review and the findings, discussions will take place to decide if and how to improve these legislative and policy frameworks and provide an enabling environment for environmental education and environmental public awareness in Armenia. A particular point will be on the need for a revised or a new national environmental education and public awareness programme.  **Output 1.2: Relevant institutions have the necessary mandates to use environmental education and public awareness as tools for environmental management.**  This output is to provide Armenia with the necessary institutional framework for the development and implementation of sustainable environmental education programmes. Activities include an assessment of the institutional framework in place in Armenia to conduct environmental education and public awareness activities. This review will assess organizations mandated by the government but also civil society organizations and universities. Based on the findings, an institutional map will be identified and support will be provided to strengthen the environmental education mandate of the key institutions/organizations.  **Component 2. Improved capacity of relevant government and educational entities to integrate environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management.**  Under this second component, project resources are used to mainstream environmental education into national strategies, programmes and projects, and also to develop environmental education programmes as well as sustainable delivery mechanisms targeting staff in the public sector and educators in Armenia. The project will start by reviewing the existing environmental education programmes in place and their alignment with the MEAs obligations, identify the gaps and needs and address the priority needs. The expected results from this outcome are national strategies, programmes and projects integrating environmental education as a tool to improve the management of natural resources, and key public sector staff and educators equipped with environmental skills and knowledge using environmental education as a tool to raise public awareness on global environmental issues and solutions being implemented in the context of the implementation of the MEAs that Armenia is a Party to.  Component 2 is expected to deliver the following outputs:  **Output 2.1: Capacity enhanced of key government and educational entities to integrate environmental education and public awareness into programmes and projects.**  This output is to mainstream environmental education into national strategies, programmes and projects, providing Armenia with an effective development apparatus that includes environmental education as a tool to raise public awareness on global and national environmental issues and solutions to be implemented at the national and local levels. Activities will include an assessment of existing key national strategies, programmes and projects, identify how environmental education and public awareness can be mainstreamed in this instruments, and support the development of new strategies, programmes and projects integrating environmental education and public awareness as tools to improve the management of natural resources.  **Output 2.2: Integrated training programmes developed and delivered through training centres for civil servants; training centres for teachers and other existing relevant training mechanisms.**  This output is to develop environmental education programmes – aligned with environmental education obligations from MEAs - and strengthen training delivery mechanisms for these programmes, providing Armenia with effective sustainable environmental education programmes targeting civil servants and educators. Activities will include a training need analysis (TNA) in the public sector to identify capacity gaps of public sector staff and also of teachers and professors. This TNA will be used to identify the training curricula needed to raise the capacity of public sector staff, teachers and professors in environmental management and particularly in how to implement environmental education programmes. Then, some training courses/programmes will be developed in close collaboration with existing training institutions to institutionalize training on environmental education in Armenia in two main areas: public sector and education sector (training of teachers and professors).  **Component 3: Developed capacity of community based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management.**  Under this third outcome, project resources will be used to develop the capacity of CBOs and of the media – including journalists - to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for conducting information awareness and environmental education activities at the community level but also at the national level through a national campaign. The expected results from this outcome are CBOs and media outlets with better capacities to deliver environmental education and environmental awareness activities at the community level but also at national level; and material developed and delivered through CBOs and the media to communities in order to raise environmental literacy of the population in Armenia. The Project will support activities to achieve the following expected outputs:  **Output 3.1: Capacity enhanced of CBOs to implement environmental education and public awareness campaigns.**  This output is to support the development of capacity of CBOs in environmental education for them to use it as a tool for natural management protection and management. Activities will include an assessment of existing CBOs to identify their strengths and weaknesses in the area of environmental education and public awareness. On this basis, the project will support activities to develop the capacity of these CBOs to deliver environmental education and public awareness programmes on global environmental issues and the obligations of Armenia under the Rio Conventions.  **Output 3.2: Environmental education material is developed and delivery mechanisms are identified.**  This output is to support the development of environmental education material and identify delivery mechanisms, which will use this material in order to increase the environmental literacy of communities. Activities will include the identification of environmental education needs for raising the environmental literacy of communities on subjects such as global/local environmental issues and international environmental agreements. The needs assessment will also aim at suggesting ways of improving the existing practices in education, which is very often difficult for practitioners. With this regard the project will also test a user research, along with the traditional needs assessment, to embed user insights into the proposed approaches.  User research focuses on understanding user behaviours, needs, and motivations through observation techniques, task analysis, interviews and other feedback methodologies.  **Output 3.3: A Communication campaign developed and delivered through community based activities and national media.**  This expected output is to support the development of a communication campaign and its delivery through community based activities and national media. Activities include the development and delivery of a communication campaign including community workshops, messages disseminated through national media, community bulletins, etc. and focusing on raising community awareness on global environmental issues and on the Rio Conventions. Publication of special environmental magazine and/or e-magazine will be considered. It will also include linkages with existing initiatives in Armenia such as the current program “Ecologica” broadcasted by Kentron TV. It is currently the only Armenian environmental program on TV. A focus will also be on raising environmental awareness of journalists who should play a critical role in raising public awareness on these same topics.  3.4. Project implementation arrangements  The Project is co-implemented by the Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP) under a UNDP’s Support to National Implementation Modality (NIM).  The Ministry of Education and Science is the main Project Beneficiary.  A Project Management Unit (PMU) is set up at the UNDP Office in Yerevan. UNDP acts as the GEF Agency for the Project.  The Technical Task Leader (TTL) was hired (EOD Aug. 2016), and, together with a programme assistant, deals with the day to day management and oversight of the delivery of the project outputs spelled out in the logical framework of the Project, under the overall guidance of the Sustainable Growth and Resilience (SGR) Portfolio Analyst (UNDP) who is the Project Coordinator.  3.5. Project timing and milestones.  The Project Document of the project under review was endorsed on 05 May 2015. The LPAC was held on June 10, 2015 and the Project Document was signed on November 3rd 2015, for the duration of 3 years.  The Project started on 03 November 2015, with a duration of 3 years.  The first Project Board meeting took place on 7 November 2016.  The Project Inception Workshop took place on June 24, 2016; the Technical Task Leader came on board in August 2016. The Inception Report was released in December 2016.  The MTR took place from November 24 to December 1th 2017.  3.6. Main Stakeholders  A complete list with all stakeholders of the Project is included as Annex 6.6. to this Report. | | | |
| 4 | FINDINGS OF THE MISSION | | | |
|  | | 4.1. Project Strategy  Project Design  As outlined in detail under chapter 3. the project’s objective is to strengthen the capacity of the relevant entities to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resources management issues.    In doing so, the Project is expected to strengthen the capacity of staff in the public sector, raise public awareness and knowledge on global environmental issues and conventions, strengthen links between sectors, etc., and contribute towards an ecologically safe and sound environment.    In order to achieve the project objective, and contribute to the achievement of the overall project goal, the project is to strengthen policies, legislation and institutional frameworks in order to effectively deliver the appropriate education programmes.  The above requires, as spelled out in the project outcomes and outputs of the logical framework of the Project, *inter alia*, the   * Analyses, review, and adjustments of the legal, policy, institutional an strategic frameworks governing environmental education; (outcome 1); * The improvement of the institutional capacities of the “relevant” entities: state, NGO’s, CBO’s, SNCO’s... (outcomes 2 and 3) and the   This, in turn, requires that:   * Based on the necessary analyses, negotiations, political debates etc., adequate legislation and policy frameworks are defined, negotiated, endorsed, put in place and enacted to mainstream conventional requirements; * Based on the necessary institutional analyses, the “relevant” entities have the necessary well defined mandates and resources to deliver the needed education and training; * Based on the necessary analyses and recommendations, the resources of a number of government and other educational institutions be adjusted/updated; * The necessary assessments of training needs are carried out; * That the necessary training programs be developed and delivered;   All above steps (and possibly more) are logical and needed, and are thus part of the work programme of the Project and its Stakeholders.  In conclusion, the Project is well designed. The only point the Mission would like to make here is that it is may be somewhat ambitious, as far as its duration is concerned.  To reduce that risk, it would have been helpful to underscore the importance of a well prepared implementation strategy, and thus to underscore the importance to the organisation of a well structured and goal oriented inception activities. See #4.3: “Project Implementation and Strategy”    Project Results Framework  The logical framework of the Project clearly describes the project goal, the project objective, the outcomes as well as the expected outputs/results of the project.  The proposed (and sound) sequence in the project implementation framework is a very important factor in a project of this kind and should be adhered to.  The Logical Framework could have been a little more precise and specific. Since the Project was designed to enable the mainstreaming and implementation of the obligations arising from the Rio and Aarhus Conventions, based on an analyses of the existing specific needs of The Republic of Armenia, designations such as: “the relevant institutions, key government institutions, diverse institutions …” should have been spelled out more specifically or by name.  If the exact definition of the institutions and their role in the implementation of the Project is not included in the original Project Document, the necessary amendments/specifications/precisions should have been made in the Inception Workshop. More under #4.3  Targets and Indicators  During the November 2016 First Project Board Meeting, a number of very pertinent questions were raised, *inter alia* on the nature and suitability of the indicators included in Logical Framework.  On that subject the meeting was informed that an international consultant was being hired and who, among other things, was to review the output indicators.  While the above consultancy was fielded, the indicators shown in the logical framework still appear somewhat “un-SMART”, and do not always allow proper assessment and monitoring of the progress.  This in part is due to the nature and complexity of the subject dealt with under the Project. | | | |
|  | | 4.2. Progress Towards Results    Progress towards outcome analyses  A good number of national and international consultants have produced reports contributing towards the achievement of the expected outputs described in the project document. They include a thorough training needs assessments, assessments of the capacities and needs of government institutions and of the CBO’s in the field of environmental education, the assessment of the national framework related to environmental education, the assessment of the national legislation and policy frameworks, the development of training materials, the development of a national strategy on environmental education (on-going at the time of the Mission), etc.. .  Since the Logical Framework does not contain Mid Term achievement indicators, progress assessment against targets is somewhat difficult by the Mission.  Sources of the information obtained by the Mission are on the one hand the 2017 Project Annual Report, the discussions with the TTL, the consultants as well as with the stakeholders.  Outcome 1   * Analysis of key policies for EE integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions requirements conducted; * Development of EE National strategy initiated. The Strategy will be/has been submitted for the approval by the Government by the end of 2017.\* (\*: please see below); * Analysis of conducive legislative framework to support EE as a tool for NRM conducted; * Organizational entities involved in developing and implementing EE programmes with their respective mandates and responsibilities identified; institutional capacity gaps and overlaps identified/prioritized.\*   Outcome 2     * Methodology on training need assessment was developed and survey involving 13 higher educational institutions was completed in June 2017. * Methodology for training needs assessment (TNA) to identify capacity gaps of governmental sector staff and self-governing bodies in the EE area was elaborated and survey was completed in June 2017. 112 respondents, representing 9 key Ministries involved in natural resource management, all 10 Regional Administrations, 69 Local Self-Governance Bodies of Municipalities of regional towns and rural communities, as well as Yerevan Municipality, were involved in survey. The analysis of results is under finalization.\*   Outcome 3   * Methodology on training need assessment was developed and survey involving 13 higher educational institutions was completed in June 2017.   The Mission wishes to draw the attention to the fact that the above information was obtained during the last days of November 2017, and that meanwhile, especially for the items marked with \* above, progress may have progressed by the time this report is formally released.  The complete “Progress Towards Results Matrix” with the rating of the different outputs is contained in the Annexes of this Report.  Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective  From the extensive discussions the Mission held with the Project Stakeholders, it appeared, at the time of the Mission, that a potential barrier in achieving the objectives of the project is related to the somewhat poor definition of the responsibilities when it comes to delivery of the environmental training. This is possibly clarified in the training strategy paper that was under preparation at the time of the Mission.  Many programmes have been carried out in the past, as national initiatives or with the help of outside funding, and there is no doubt that the GoA attaches a great deal of importance to the topic. One of the major problems is that funding is often directed towards a given institution, and therefore the impact is not always as “institutionally wide” as it should be. This leads to numerous programmes, including analyses, training etc. but sometimes with a limited focus and/or target. The project under review takes credit in the fact that it looks at the entire sector, across institutions.  In the view of the Mission, and as a great deal of the preparatory work has been accomplished, the best way forward is to jointly and in a participatory manner prepare an overall roadmap with clear duties and responsibilities and inputs of each of the participating agencies (who does what?) in this final action programme. | | |
|  | | 4.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management  Project cycle/implementation planning and strategy  Past experiences with the “improvement, upgrading…” of institutional capacities, including legal aspects, has often shown that such interventions take persuasion, courage, political will, agreements; will need sufficient time, and above all a clear joint **goal oriented strategy**, **accepted and endorsed by all stakeholders.**  In case such endorsed strategy and roadmap are not well prepared, the project is bound to encounter implementation problems during its later stages.  In fact there are numerous examples, in Armenia and elsewhere, (with all due respect), where, at the end of the road, the proposed legal and institutional amendments were never endorsed and ratified…    For that very reason, it is so crucial that all stakeholders jointly look at the expected project outputs and outcomes, take their respective responsibilities and jointly prepare a roadmap (“who does what”) for the upcoming implementation activities. All the above (and sometimes more) is the **very purpose of the** **inception** **workshop**: the definition of the layout/roadmap for the smooth implementation of the Project.  While some of the planned project activities are relatively easy and straightforward, (e.g. the analyses and assessments), bringing about institutional changes (capacities, legal aspects, strategies, mandates,…) is generally time consuming, and can not be expected overnight for one institution, let alone for a set of government and non government entities.  In the absence of project preparatory forum as explained above, a project, especially of this kind, is more likely to run into difficulties.  Only after completion of the above, the actual activities can be embarked upon. It is crucial that in particular the key government agencies actively participate in such exercise as they are the makers/amenders of the laws, the custodians of the laws, and most often the enforcing entities.  From the numerous discussions, formal and informal, the Mission has undertaken with the various stakeholders, the Mission understands that the “environmental education and training institutional environment”, with all due respect to the individual institutions, is somehow complex.  For the above reason, and as shown in the logical chronology in the project framework components, the delivery of the planned training programmes should not be started before the achievement of all legal and institutional requirements are achieved, and that a clear roadmap for the delivery of the training programmes be prepared and adopted by all partners of the programme.    Management Arrangements  The Project started on 03 November 2015, with a duration of 3 years.  A Project Management Unit (PMU) was set up within UNDP to deal with the day to day management of the Project.  The Technical Task Leader (TTL) was hired (EOD Aug. 2016), and, together with a programme assistant, deals with the day to day oversight of the delivery of the project outputs spelled out in the logical framework of the Project, under the overall guidance of the Sustainable Growth and Resilience (SGR) Portfolio Analyst (UNDP) who is the Project Coordinator.  The Project Inception Workshop took place on June 24, 2016; the Technical Task Leader came on board in August 2016. The Inception Report was released in December 2016. The MTR took place from November 24 to December 1th .  The Mission notes that the Project start-up was delayed, which in itself is not a major problem. What was more unfortunate is that the Inception Workshop, the importance of which has been sufficiently highlighted in this report, was carried out before the TTL was on board.  Project Financing  A table on page 2 lists the financial inputs into the Project.    Project cycle/work planning  On the work planning, the Project experienced some delays at its start off.  Such delays in themselves often have their reasons, and should not be seen necessarily as a handicap to the sound and successful implementation of a project, except in some cases where deadlines are a crucial factor.  The Technical Task Leader came on board some 9 months after project start up (August 2016).  The Inception Workshop (June 2016) was organised on June 2016.  The Inception Report was released in December 2016.  Comments  Because of the very nature and purpose of the inception phase of a project, this activity should be held upon the start of the project and for a limited duration (2 months as determined in the PRODOC which contains all necessary details of this crucial stage within the project cycle.  The Inception Workshop of this project was more of the nature of a project launching ceremony than of a round table workshop where the project work plan is unfolded and with the participation of all stakeholders, the necessary roadmap of the Project is clarified and agreed upon, with a clear definition of the role and responsibilities of the various stakeholders and other entities; in other terms, it defines : “who does what” in the Project (implementation).  Such complicated “institutional division of tasks” takes more than 3 hours in order to get all those concerned on board and to define the roles of the various stakeholders. From the report it is clear that the meeting was merely a briefing on the project, followed by the official launching.  While there is absolutely nothing wrong with such briefing and formal launching of the Project, such activity should not be labelled “Inception Workshop”.  More importantly, the Inception Phase Report, including the “workshop”, basically mentions information contained in the project document. The list of the various institutions involved in the Project and their anticipated tasks  was established in 2014 when preparing the Project Document. The very purpose of the Inception Workshop is to determine, upon project start up, in very concrete and specific terms, and taking into account possible changes that may have happened between formulation and project start-up, the exact responsibilities and specific roles of the different stakeholders. Such workshop, especially for a project that involves several major institutions, may take a week or more.  The Mission feels that the lack of institutional clarity was aired in a number of consultations with stakeholders.  The Project Board  A Project Board was set up, co-chaired by UNDP and the GoA. It comprises a representative of the Ministry of Nature Protection of the RoA (Co-Chair), a representative of the Ministry of Education and Science, and a representation of UNDP Yerevan (Co-Chair).  The first board meeting took place in November 2016 and highlighted/illustrated *inter alia* some of the shortcomings of the Inception Report, mentioned above. One Board Member enquired about the target group of the Project; it was also suggested to redefine/update the roles of stakeholders identified in the Project Document…    Had a more organised inception phase/workshop taken place, such fundamental questions should not be necessary. It shows that even at the first Board Meeting, some very fundamental questions on the “who does what?” remained unresolved.  In fact the issue of the “who does what?” was brought up by a number of stakeholders interviewed by the Mission.  Stakeholder engagement  In the view of the Mission, Stakeholders of the Project are committed to the achievement of the goals of the Project, and all showed eagerness in participating in the process and some sense of ownership of the Project. The importance of the clear assignment of responsibilities for the implementation of the various training programmes was cited as an important issue during some of the discussions.  Reporting  Two Annual Reports (2016 and 2017) and a Semestrial Report (Jan-June 2017) were prepared by the Project and reviewed by the Mission. The Reports tend to be somewhat unclear on the achievements, especially when it comes to the various institutional matters. The mission however fully understands, as pointed out under chapter 4.2. that such adjustments take often more time than expected.  The chronology in the listing of the outcomes, outputs and activities in the logical framework should be respected as much as possible, hence its “logic”. For that reason the Mission thinks that delivery of training prior to the accomplishment of the fundamentals (policies, legal frameworks, institutional adjustments) may not be advisable, and could harm sustainability to some extent.     |  | | --- | | Rating Project Implementation and Adaptive Management:  Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | | | | |
|  | | 4.4. Sustainability  Financial risks to sustainability  At the time of the Mission there was no indication financial and economic resources would be inadequate after completion of the Project.  Socio-economic and institutional framework risks to sustainability  Institutional changes are sometimes difficult to bring about unless the needs have been generated and nurtured by within the institutions themselves.  At the time of the Mission, some 17 consultants had been contracted by the Project, two of them being consulting firms, involving teams.    While there is no doubt that a number of consultants are required for a project of this kind, making the number of consultants “heavy” may sometimes trigger an adverse effect on the receptiveness of the institutions themselves, and may harm the sustainability of the operation.  The Mission therefore suggests to try to enhance involvement/ownership of the Project by the Stakeholders in order to proceed successfully through the final phase of the Project, including the endorsement and ratification of all institutional and legal changes.   |  | | --- | | Rating for Sustainability: Moderately likely (ML) | | | | |
|  | 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  It should be noted that the Mission took place at the end of November 2017. Some of the issues or recommendations brought up in the Report may already have been adjusted or being dealt with by the time of the release of this Report.    5.1. Conclusions   * Many programmes have been carried out in the past, covering various aspects of natural resources/biodiversity conservation and management: legal, institutional, educational etc. , as national initiatives or with the help of external support, and there is no doubt that the GoA attaches a great deal of importance to the topic.   One of the reasons is that funding is often directed towards a given institution, and therefore the impact is not always as “institutionally wide” as it should be. This leads to numerous programmes, including analyses, training etc. but with a limited focus and/or target.  The project under review takes special credit in the fact that it looks at  the entire sector, across institutions.   * Developments on the international front (Rio, Aarhus) and on the domestic front (enhanced concern and awareness) make it that new legal, institutional (mainstreaming) and practical (training) arrangements are updated. * The Project was well prepared, the framework is “logical”. It could have provided some better definition in the description of outcomes, outputs and activities. Terms like “relevant institutions”, “key entities”, “relevant agencies” should have been more specific/by name; also additional precision would have allowed “smarter” indicators in the logical framework. * Despite its delayed startup, the Project delivered a great deal of information mainly with the work of numerous consultants. That work relates mainly to assessments (training needs, legislation, institutional requirements, strategies, etc.). * While the Project is timely and well designed, its planned duration may be inadequate. Bringing about policy, legal, and institutional changes are processes that require considerable time, and most of the time a project can do little to accelerate such processes as they are governed mainly by the government agencies. * The logical framework has an appropriate (and logical) sequence of activities and that sequence should be respected through the project implementation: delivering the practical components (e.g. education and training) prior to the accomplishment of the legal and institutional matters could harm the sustainability of the Project.      * The above institutional amendments/adjustments will also allow a rational division of the work related to education and training. At the moment of the MTR, it appeared that the question of “who does what” in terms delivering the training, is very crucial. The institutional clarifications, amendments and adjustments should clarify the picture as to the responsibilities of the stakeholders in the Government and beyond. * Given the institutional complexity surrounding environmental education and awareness building, and the diversity of actions/adjustments that are to be undertaken (legal, institutional, etc.) the Mission feels that a well structured, analytical and goal oriented inception workshop is fundamental and indispensable at the start-up such project. The Workshop held June 2016, in the view of the Mission, was a launching ceremony, and did not have the ingredients mentioned above. Neither did the Inception Report, released end December 2016 contain the analyses and roadmap it is expected to come up with. For that reason the Project started its operations in an institutional environment where not all stakeholders had a clear view of their roles and responsibilities.   For a project with a single/simple institutional anchor, such activity and its deriving roadmap may be less crucial, however for this Project the environmental landscape is rather divers. Therefore a well planned Inception Workshop and its Report are extremely important milestones in the project cycle, to clear the road ahead. | | | |
|  |  | | 5.2. Recommendations     * The chronology in the listing of the outcomes, outputs and activities in the logical framework should be respected as much as possible; for that reason the Mission feels that the delivery of training prior to the accomplishment of the institutional fundamentals (policies, legal frameworks, institutional adjustments) should be avoided as much as possible. * A number of externally funded related projects appear to be in the pipeline (World Bank, EC) or are ongoing (GTZ). These entities should be included in the PAC in order to generate synergy, cooperation and coordination. * A clear and well defined list of all training packages that are planned under education, training and awareness raising activities under outcomes #2 and #3 should be prepared. Training packages should be clearly specified (provider, target group, curriculum etc..) * The Project should prepare, soonest, a precise, detailed and prioritized list of all issues and tasks (analytical, strategic, legal, institutional etc.) that remain on the table, for each of the three components of the Project. * A clear, precise and well defined practical roadmap should be prepared in order to use the remaining time of the Project in the most effective and efficient way. * Such roadmap should be derived at (preferably) in a participative manner by organizing e.g. a workshop involving all stakeholders in this crucial planning process. The workshop should be guided and moderated by a institutionally neutral facilitator.   Alternatively a roadmap proposal could be prepared, submitted to the  participants and endorsed at the meeting. The Mission favours the first  proposal which has the benefit of better participation, synergy and  institutions’ ownership.   * The above (endorsed) roadmap should clearly define “who does what?” during the remaining time of the Project. * If the implementation or coordination of the training programs are to be handled by a single (main) government agency, it may be advisable to move the PMU to that agency. It will enhance ownership, effectiveness, efficiency and not the least: sustainability. In doing so, UNDP could gradually phase out its role while the GoA increases its stake and responsibility in the operation. * In view of the above, a no cost 6 to 12 months project extension appears unavoidable, while attempting to increase effectiveness and efficiency.      * *“Institutional changes are sometimes short lived unless they have been*   *nurtured and supported from within the institution itself”.* | | |
|  | |  | |
|  | 6. ANNEXES TO THE REPORT   1. MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) 2. MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) 3. List of persons interviewed 4. List of documents reviewed | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
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# INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled “**Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders**’’ (PIMS 5309) implemented through the UNDP/Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia (RoA), to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on November 03, 2015 and is in its second year of implementation.. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* [[1]](#footnote-1)[http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\_Midterm Review \_EN\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

# PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The goal of this project is to expand the capacity of Armenia to generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders to implement Rio Convention strategies. The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resource management issues. The achievement of this objective will strengthen the capacity of staff in the public sector, raise the public awareness about global environmental issues and the related international conventions, strengthen the links between sectors, including the mainstreaming of environmental concerns in development policies and projects, and finally contribute to an ecologically safe and sound environment.

The project objective will be achieved through three components (outcomes): i) enhance legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raise awareness of stakeholders as natural resource management tools; ii) improve the capacity of relevant educational entities and organizations, offering environmental education to integrate environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management; iii) develop capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management.

These activities will contribute to UNDP Strategic Plan Output 2.5 “Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation”.

The project activities commenced in middle 2016 with conclusion planned for late 2018.

The project runs on principal allocations of 750,000 USD from GEF and additional input of 30,000 USD from UNDP and planned co-financing of 693,735 USD as in-kind contributions from Government of RoA, UNDP and NGOs.

The Project Board provides consensus-based decisions, in particular when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator (PC) and has final authority on matters requiring official review and approval, including annual work plans, budgets, and key hires. The Project Board actively seeks and takes account of the input of the Technical Advisory Committee that meets annually, with periodic consultation as needed throughout the year.

UNDP acts as the GEF Agency for this project. The project is implemented by the Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP) following UNDP’s National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Ministry of Education and Science based on the mandate in addressing educational policy in the country, including environmental education is the primary beneficiary of the project.

# OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

# MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Report (APR)/, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[2]](#footnote-2) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[3]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CBOs, etc.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

# DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators (Annex D) against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st APR self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicators 1-4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 5-7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicators 8-11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:** | Indicators 12-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse Capacity Development (CD) scorecards at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, APR/ and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR consultant will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for “Green Urban Lighting” UNDP-GEF/00074869-00087057 Project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

# TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be up to *15 days* over a time period of *8 weeks* starting *from the first day of the mission,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *October 10, 2017* | Application closes |
| *October 31, 2017* | Select MTR consultant |
| *November 1-3, 2017* | Prep the MTR consultant (handover of Project Documents) |
| *November 6-10, 3 days* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *November 15, 1 day* | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report - latest start of MTR mission |
| *November 27- December 1, 5 days* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, wrap-up workshop |
| *December 4 – 15, 6 days* | Preparing draft report |
| *January 8-12, 1 days* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report |
| *Up to 2 weeks after receiving the draft report* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *1 week after receiving the Management Response* | Expected date of full MTR completion |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

# DELIVERABLES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR consultants clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 week before the MTR mission  November 10, 2017 | MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission  December 1, 2017 | MTR consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission  December 15, 2017 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  February 9, 2018 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

# ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Armenia Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure all necessary support throughout the process, including with travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

# TEAM COMPOSITION

The independent international consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) will conduct the MTR with support of local expert group and administrative team of the project. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the qualifications in the below areas. 70% of points will be awarded for the technical qualifications and 30% for the financial bid.

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to MFA-  Cross-cutting capacity development areas;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in CIS countries and in the Caucasus countries;
* Work experience in projects evaluation for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender equality and CCCD; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in Environment, or other closely related field.

# PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

# APPLICATION PROCESS[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[11]](#footnote-11));
2. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability /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](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

**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

**ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Consultant**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Country Programme Document 2016-2020
5. UN Development Assistance Framework 2016-2020
6. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
7. Project Inception Report
8. Annual Project Report (APR)
9. Semi-annual and Annual progress reports and work plans
10. Capacidy development scorecards
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Minutes of the Project Outcome Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Technical Advisory Committee meetings)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Annex 2 PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Rating** |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline level** | **End of Project** | **PTRM** |
| **Objective:** | 1 Use of EE and environmental awareness tools to address NRM |   These tools & techniques on EE and EA are rarely used for NRM in Armenia |   Diverse and high quality EE and EA programmes are available to address NRM |  |  |
| **To strengthen capacity to use EE and EA as tools to address** | MS |
| **NRM issues** |  |
|  | 2 Citizens involvement in decision-making to address NRM issues |   Few opportunities for stakeholder involvement in NRM decisions at national or community levels |   Stakeholders in selected areas are involved in decision-making to address NRM issues |  |  |
|  | MS |
|  | 3 Decision-makers and teachers able to use EE as a tool to improve NRM. |   Few key stakeholders have the capacity to use EE as a tool to address NRM issues |   Decision-makers and teachers using EE as a tool to improve NRM |  | S |
|  | 4 Capacity development scorecard rating | Capacity for: | Capacity for: |  |  |
|  |     Engagement: 5 of 9 |    Engagement: 7 of 9 |  |
|  |     Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 7 of 15 |    Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 11 of 15 |  |
|  |     Policy and legislation development: 6 of 9 |    Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9 |  |
|  |     Management and implementation: 3 of 6 |    Management and implementation: 4 of 6 |  |
|  |     Monitor and evaluate: 3 of 6 |    Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 | S |
|  | (Total score: 24/45) | (Total targeted score: 33/45) |  |
| **OUTCOME 1: Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholder as natural resource management tools.** | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1:** Adequate legislation and policy frameworks are in place to implement obligations from the Rio and Aarhus Conventions related to environmental education and public awareness. | 5       Adequate policies for EE in place integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations |        Current policies are poorly known, weakly implemented and do not include EE as an effective tool to address NRM issues. |   Key policies for EE in place integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations and providing an conducive enabling environment for the development of EE in Armenia |  |  |
|  |  |
| **Output 1.2:** Relevant institutions have the necessary mandates to use environmental education and public awareness as tools for environmental management. | S |
|  | 6       Adequate legislation for EE in place |        Current Law on environmental education as well as related laws are not conducive to the use of EE as a tool for NRM |   EE as a tool for NRM is supported by a conducive legislation framework |  | S |
|  | 7       Adequate institutional set-up with clear mandate to carry out EE activities |        Weak institutional mandates, weak national coordination and unclear responsibilities for EE |   Institutions with clear mandates and assigned responsibilities to implement EE programmes |  |  |
|  | S |
|  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|
| **OUTCOME 2: Improved capacity of relevant government and educational entities to integrate** | | | | | | |
| **environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management.** | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2.1:** Capacity enhanced of key government and educational entities to integrate environmental education and public awareness into programmes and projects. | 9       Strategies and programmes integrating EE and public awareness as tools to improve NRM |        Current strategies and programmes do not include EE as a tool to address NRM issues. |        Key strategies and programmes includes EE as a tool to address NRM issues and solutions, including integration of Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations |  |  |
|  |  |
| **Output 2.2:** Integrated training programmes developed and delivered through training centers for civil servants; training centers for teachers and other existing relevant training mechanisms. | S |
|  | 9 Number and diversity of organizations and individuals trained (men and women) to deliver EE programmes |        Few key stakeholders are trained to develop and deliver EE programmes in Armenia |        key stakeholders in different organizations are trained to deliver EE programmes with a minimum of 40% women |  |  |
|  | S |
|  | 10     Quantity and quality of EE materials and delivery mechanisms |        EE training materials for civil servants is very limited |        EE programmes and delivery mechanisms available to public servants and practicing teachers |  |  |
|  |        Limited EE training delivery mechanisms targeting civil servants |  |
|  |        Existing EE programmes to train teachers in pedagogical universities | S |
|  |        Uneven delivery of these EE programmes to teachers, particularly practicing teachers |  |
|  | 11    Number of participants (men and women) trained in EE |        Limited training currently offered |        1,000 people trained (civil servants and teachers) with a minimum of 40% women |  |  |
|  | S |
| **OUTCOME 3: Developed capacity of community based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management** | | | | | | |
|  | 12    Increased use of environmental awareness techniques in programmes and projects to address NRM and poverty reduction at the community level |        NGOs, CBOs and local governments use very little EE techniques |   NGOs, CBOs and local governments are using EE as a tool to make communities environmentally aware and to involve them in addressing NRM issues |  |  |
| **Output 3.1:** Capacity enhanced of CBOs to implement environmental education and public awareness campaigns. |  |
|  | S |
| **Output 3.2:** Environmental education material is developed and delivery mechanisms are identified. | 13    EE and awareness material developed and use by delivery mechanisms |        Numerous materials on EE exist in Armenia but there is no common approach to deliver EE covering global environmental issues and solutions | 14               Existence of EE programmes delivered by strengthened delivery mechanisms |  |  |
|  | S |
| **Output 3.3:** A Communication campaign developed and delivered through community based activities and national media. |  |
|  | 14    A communication campaign developed and delivered |        Skills and knowledge to develop such campaign is currently limited in Armenia | 15               A communication campaign delivered and covering global environmental issues and solutions |  | S |
|  | 15     Number of journalists (men and women) and diversity of media outlets trained to deliver EE programmes |        Journalists and their media outlets have limited capacity to inform the public on NRM issues, including global environmental issues and solutions | 16               100 journalists with a minimum of 40% women linked to a diverse number of media outlets trained in environmental awareness, including global environmental issues and solutions |  | S |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Annex 3 People met (chronological) | | |
| Date | Name | Function and Office |
| 24/11 | Armine Poghosian | Project Technical Task Leader |
| 24 | Tatevik Markosyan | Project Assistant |
| 24 | Ruzanna Khachatryan | Head Dev. Prog. & Prof. Excel. Dep, Civil Serv. Council |
| 24 | Manvel Badalyan | Chairman Civil Service Council |
| 24 | Kristine Karapetyan | Civil Service Council |
| 27 | Georgi Arzumanyan | UNDP SGR Policy advisor |
| 27 | Tatevik Koloyan | UNDP Environmental Programme Associate |
| 27 | Arman Melkonyan | AM Partners Consulting Company UC |
| 27 | Vahe Mambreyan | AM Partners Consulting Company UC |
| 28 | Alen Amirkhanian | AUA |
| 28 | Karine Danielyan | Consultant, State Pedagogical University |
| 28 | Narine Hovhannisyan | Consultant |
| 28 | Melanya Davtyan | Consultant |
| 28 | Samvel Baloyan | Consultant |
| 28 | Gayane Hovhannisyan | Consultant |
| 28 | Serob Khachatryan | Consultant |
| 28 | Anastas Aghazaryan | Consultant |
| 28 | Silva Abelyan | UNDP HR |
| 29 | Robert Stepanyan | Head, Dev. Progr. Monitoring MoES/Board Member |
| 29 | Armen Vardanyan | MNP /Board Member |
| 30 | Arsen Lokyan | Rector, Public Administration Academy of Armenia |
| 30 | Heghine Hakhverdyan | Consultant |
| 01 | Armenak Antinyan | Consultant |
| 04/12 | Armen Martirosyan | Head SGR, UNDP |
| 05 | Lucine Gharajyan | Advisor GIZ Yerevan |
| 05 | Aram Ter-Zakaryan | UNDP Advisor |



**Mid-term Evaluation Mission by Mr. Charles Vanpraet**

**Yerevan, Armenia**

### 24 November-1 December 2017

**Mission Schedule**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Meeting/Purpose** | | **Venue** | **Participants** | **Interpreter (Yes/No)** |
| 24 November 2017, Friday – Arrival to Yerevan | | | | | |
| 11:00-13:00 | | Meeting with Environmental Education Project (EEP) | UNDP Armenia | * Mrs. Armine Poghosyan, EEP Technical Task Leader * Mrs. Tatevik Markosyan, EPP Assistant | No |
| 16:30-17:30 | | Meeting with Civil Service Council | Civil Service Council | * Ruzanna Khachatryan, Head of Development Programs and Professional Excellence department | No |
| 25 November 2017, Saturday; 26 November 2017, Sunday | | | | | |
| 27 November 2017, Monday | | | | | |
| 10:00-13:00 | Meeting with Environmental Education Project (EEP) | | UNDP Armenia | * Mrs. Armine Poghosyan, EEP Technical Task Leader * Mrs. Tatevik Markosyan, EPP Assistant | No |
| 14:00-15:00 | Meeting with UNDP SGR Portfolio | | UNDP Armenia | * Mr. Georgi Arzumanyan, UNDP, SGR Policy Adviser * Mrs. Tatevik Koloyan, Environmental Programme Associate | No |
| 16:30-18:00 | Meeting with AM Partners | | UNDP Armenia | * Vahe Mambreyan * Arman Melkonyan | No |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 28 November 2017, Tuesday | | | | |
| 9:00-11:00 | Meeting with AUA | AUA | Mr.Alen Amirkhanyan, Director of the American University of Armenia’s (AUA) Acopian Center for the Environment, | No |
| 12:00-13:00 | Meeting with Consultant  Capacity and need assessment of Education Institutions | ASPU | Mrs. Karine Danielyan, head of the SPUA Chair of Ecology and Sustainable Development, Armenian State Pedagogical University | Yes |
| 14:00-15:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 15:00-17:00 | Meeting with consultants, Development of National Strategy on Environmental Education | UNDP Armenia | Mr.Samvel Baloyan,  deputy director of the “Environmental Project Implementation Unit”, MNP | Yes |
| 29 November 2017, Wednesday | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Meeting in the Ministry of Education and Science (EPP Senior Beneficiary) | MoES | Mr. Robert Stepanyan, Head of the Department of the Development Programme and Monitoring, RoA Ministry of Education and Science, Project Board Member | Yes |
| 14:00-15:00 | Meeting in the Ministry of Nature Protection (EPP Executive) | Ministry of Nature Protection | Mr. Armen Vardanyan, Head of the Information and Public Relation Department, RoA Ministry of Nature Protection, Project Board Co-Chair | Yes |
| 30 November 2017, Thursday | | | | |
| 9:30-10:30 | Meeting in PAARA | PAARA | Arsen Lokyan, Public Administration Academy of the Republic of Armenia | Yes |
| 14:30-16:30 | Meeting with expert,  Assessment of national legislation and policy frameworks in the field of EE in Armenia” | UNDP Armenia | Heghine Hakhverdyan, Lecture and researcher at Environmental Law Resource Center of Yerevan State University | No |
| 01 December 2017, Friday | | | | |
| 10:00-11:30 | Meeting with Expert,  Behavioral Scientist | UNDP Armenia | Armenak Antinyan, Innovation Specialist (Behavioral Economist) for Sustainable Development Goals at UNDP Armenia. | No |

Annex 4 List of the documents consulted

1. Project document
2. Terms of reference and related documents
3. Project progress reports
4. Project Inception Report
5. Project consultants’ reports
6. Project’s first Board meeting (Nov. 2016)

1. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)