



## United Nations Development Programme

### Terms of Reference

<b>Position:</b>	National Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the GEF- UNDP project
<b>Project title:</b>	PIMS 5358- "Supporting sustainable land management in steppe and semi-arid zones through integrated territorial planning and agro-environmental incentives".
<b>Type of Contract</b>	IC – Individual Contract
<b>Contract Duration:</b>	December 2020 – March 2021 (35 workdays)
<b>Duty Station</b>	Home based with possible 2 field trips (subject of COVID-19 quarantine measures absence)

#### 1. Evaluation Background

In accordance with GEF-UNDP M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

The Final Evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global and national environmental goals. The Final Evaluation also identifies/documents lessons learned and makes recommendations that project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related projects and programs.

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the "GEF Evaluation Policy" (see [http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-me-policy-2019\\_2.pdf](http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-me-policy-2019_2.pdf))

This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Kazakhstan as the GEF Implementing Agency for the **"Supporting sustainable land management in steppe and semi-arid zones through integrated territorial planning and agro-environmental incentives"** project and it aims to provide managers (at the level of regulatory bodies of the Ministry of Agriculture, and GEF/UNDP) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and with a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

#### 2. Project Background

The Government of Kazakhstan requested GEF incremental assistance in sustainable land management in critical, productive, steppe, arid and semi-arid landscapes found in Akmola, Kostanay, North and East Kazakhstan Oblasts (i.e., the northern steppe zone: forest steppe, meadow steppe and dry steppe ecosystems), and Almaty and Kyzyl Orda Oblasts (i.e., the southern arid zone: desert and steppe semi-desert ecosystems) of the country. Support was needed to change existing patterns of land use and improve land conditions by strengthening agricultural financial mechanisms and the current land-use planning system, which are the basic financial and administrative drivers of land use, thus addressing land degradation problems in the long term.

The project has built its implementation activities upon existing national subsidy programs in the agricultural sector, as well as on the national environmental development approach by facilitating integrated land use planning, with the emphasis being on decentralization and bottom-up planning, as opposed to the existing highly centralized, top-down system. This includes the wider application of a new financial mechanism in pasture and productive landscape management. Building upon the experience of GEF funded projects' efforts, the project created a more conducive policy and legal framework for establishment of agro-environmental incentives for sustainable and better integrated pasture and land use planning and management and build national and local capacity for practical implementation of such planning in the field. Existing best practices and approaches were replicated at a wider scale within selected representative oblasts.

The project document was signed in August 2015, and its implementation started in October 2015. Total project budget is US\$ 9,499,459 million, US\$1,9 million of which is a contribution from GEF. Implementing Agency from the part of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan is the Analytical center for economic research in agro-industrial complex of the Ministry of Agriculture of RK.

The Republic of Kazakhstan (RK) is the largest land-locked country in Central Asia. It is the ninth largest country in the world in terms of land area, spanning 271.73 million hectares. It extends almost 2,000 km from the Caspian Sea in the west to the border of China in the east and nearly 1,300 km from central Siberia in the north to eastern Uzbekistan in the south. The Republic borders Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and the Kyrgyz Republic in the south, Russia in the north, China in the east, and the Caspian Sea in the west. The country had an estimated population of 17,037,508 in 2013<sup>1</sup>, with a low population density of six persons per square kilometer<sup>2</sup>.

Dryland ecosystems (i.e., desert, desertified and dryland steppe ecosystems) cover most of the country (99 percent of its territory) with annual average precipitation of 100-200 millimetres. Land area used in agriculture totals 222.6 million hectares, 10.8 percent of which is covered by field crops, 2.2 percent by hayfields, and 85 percent by pastures.<sup>3</sup> The availability of arable land per inhabitant (1.5 hectares) is the second highest in the world.<sup>4</sup>

An estimated 82% of all land types in the country, of which about 80% is agricultural land, is subject to erosion. Wind and water erosion affect over 67% of rain-fed areas, resulting in loss of humus content in topsoil (20% in the past 30 years)<sup>5</sup>. The main economic consequences of desertification and land degradation are reduced agricultural yields and crop production; decreased cattle and camel stocks and declining profitability of animal husbandry; decreased export capacity of agriculture; stagnation of the agribusiness sector; and a sharp decrease in tax revenue from the agricultural and food processing sectors. The total annual economic loss due to a mixture of land degradation and poor agricultural management in Kazakhstan is estimated to be around \$700,000,000, with poor households paying the highest price<sup>6</sup>.

The southern arid regions and the northern steppe zones of Kazakhstan, which are the focus of this UNDP/GEF project, are no exception. The southern arid regions of Kazakhstan are particularly prone to desertification with about 75% of arable and pasturelands ranked with a desertification index of high to very high. Areas of land subject to wind erosion occupy 25.5 million ha, and those subject to water erosion more than 5 million ha, of which 1 million ha are arable land. The largest areas of land affected by water erosion can be observed in the southern regions of Kazakhstan – 958.7 thousand ha in total – of which eroded arable land makes up 223.6 thousand ha. The processes of erosion on irrigated fields and pastures in southern regions of Kazakhstan have

<sup>1</sup> Data from <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/views/reports/tableview.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> Data from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.DNST>

<sup>3</sup> Ministry of Agriculture (2013)

<sup>4</sup> OECD (2013), OECD Review of Agricultural Policies: Kazakhstan 2013, OECD Publishing.

<sup>5</sup> The Fourth National Report of Kazakhstan on Implementation of the UNCCD (with comments and additions). 2012. Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>6</sup> CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Project Document, 2006, Asian Development Bank

developed rapidly in recent years: every year 19 million tons of soil are washed off with 400 thousand tons of humus. This means that about 2.5–2.6 million tons of manure would be needed annually to cover these losses<sup>7</sup>.

The northern steppe zone lands are also highly susceptible to wind and water erosion due to loss of humus and vegetation cover resulting from the massive conversion of steppe to grain farming and ongoing unsustainable farming and pastoral practices in these already marginal lands. Soil erosion processes show high intensity in the Akmola, southern regions (Kzyl Orda, Southern Kazakhstan and Almaty).

Today, over 62% of winter pastures and 71% of summer pastures are eroded and the quality of pastures has declined by 4-5 times compared to the 1980s<sup>8</sup>. Kazakhstan's rangelands are susceptible to droughts, inadequate natural regeneration, widespread aerial transportation of sand and salt (affecting some 30 million ha) and formation of salinized or "solonchak" lands (more than 93 million ha).<sup>9</sup> Between 1951 and 2011, the stocking rate of livestock increased 5 times over the carrying capacity of pastures. Just in the past decade, sheep grazing in Kazakhstan has nearly tripled. The pressure on pastures is intensified by the declining practice of moving livestock between summer and winter pastures, and increased livestock density, especially in areas around settlements, i.e. communal winter pastures<sup>10</sup>. Despite their low productivity, vast horizontal pasturelands<sup>11</sup> are being used increasingly for sheep grazing, leading to soil erosion and mudslides. The combined impact generates erosion, depleted soil carbon stocks, increased frequency of mudslides with significant economic and social costs downstream in the form of flooded villages and damaged infrastructure.

The Project is fully consistent with the GEF-5 Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy and addresses objective 3 of this strategy namely, "LD-3: Reducing pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape', by promoting integrated territorial planning at the rayon level, and engineering a shift from unsustainable land use practices to sustainable land management. The project introduces the concept of Integrated Land Use Planning and implements investments to demonstrate its viability in six oblasts. The indirect area of influence of the project is the entire agricultural landscape of the country – pasture and other agricultural lands – which totals 222.6 million ha. The project can potentially be scaled up to this area, which is the area with highest sensitivity to land degradation threats under impending climate change. These activities are in conformity with Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 of the GEF LD-3 strategic objective. For the first time in Kazakhstan and in post-Soviet regions, the project introduces the concept of agro-environmental incentive payments as an innovative funding mechanism supporting SLM measures. Through these LD-focused activities, the project helps to prevent soil erosion, loss of productivity and other ecosystem services in the steppe zone in Kazakhstan, contributing to carbon sequestration and avoidance of emissions in/ from the soil layer.

### 3. Objectives and Tasks of the Assignment

The objective of the Evaluation is to assess the achievement of project objective, the affecting factors, the broader project impact and the contribution to the general goal/strategy, and the project partnership strategy.

The national consultant, based in Kazakhstan, will facilitate the International Consultant/Team Leader and provide necessary substantive and operational support in carrying out this evaluation.

Project success will be measured based on Revised Project Logical Framework (see Annex 1), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of

<sup>7</sup> Saparov, A. 2014. Novel Measurement and Assessment Tools for Monitoring and Management of Land and Water Resources in Agricultural Landscapes of Central Asia. Soil Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan: Current status, problems and solutions.

<sup>8</sup> According to the Committee of Land Resources of the Ministry of Regional Development of Kazakhstan

<sup>9</sup> National Programming Framework of Kazakhstan under CACILM. 2009

<sup>10</sup> Landscape and biological diversity in the Republic of Kazakhstan. UNDP (2005)

<sup>11</sup> Seasonal movements of livestock can be vertical (winter & summer pastures) or horizontal (moving the livestock along the same horizontal trail based on climate conditions -- such as temperature, moisture content – and forage availability during a day.

verification. The evaluation will assess the aspects as listed in evaluation report outline attached in Annex 2.

The Evaluation will focus on the following aspects:

- Project design and its relevance in relation to:
  - a) *Development priorities* at the national level;
  - b) *Stakeholders* – assess if the specific needs were met;
  - c) *Country ownership* – participation and commitments of government, local authorities, public services, utilities, residents;
  - d) *UNDP mission to promote sustainable human development (SHD)* by assisting the country to build its capacities in the focal area of integrated land management, environmental protection and management;
  
- Performance - look at the progress that has been made by the project relative to the achievement of its objective and outcomes;
  - a) *Effectiveness* - extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and the desired outcomes, and the overall contribution of the project to national strategic objectives;
  - b) *Efficiency* - assess efficiency against overall impact of the project for better projection of achievements and benefits resulting from project resources, including an assessment of the different implementation modalities and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of GEF resources and actual co-financing for the achievement of project results;
  - c) *Timeliness* of results,
  
- Management arrangements focused on project implementation:
  - a) *General implementation and management* - evaluate the adequacy of the project, implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the UNDP Country Office, the partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to UNDP/GEF requirements and also from the perspective of “good (or bad) practice model” that could be used for replication / learning useful lessons.
  - b) *Financial accountability* – extent to which the sound financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems and adjustment of activities, budgets and inputs
  - c) *Monitoring and evaluation on project level* – assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation, and its internalization by competent authorities and service providers after the completion of the project; focusing to relevance of the performance indicators, that are:
    - Specific: The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective and only that objective.
    - Measurable: The monitoring system and indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what it covers and there are practical ways to measure it.
    - Achievable and Attributable: The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
    - Relevant and Realistic: The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
    - Time-bound, Timely, Trackable and Targeted: The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of particular stakeholders group to be impacted by the project.
  
- Overall success of the project with regards to the following criteria:
  - a) *Impact* - assessment of results with reference to development objectives of the project and the achievement of sustainable land management in critical, productive, steppe, arid and semi-arid landscapes found in Akmola, Kostanai, North and East Kazakhstan Oblasts (i.e., the northern steppe

zone: forest steppe, meadow steppe and dry steppe ecosystems), and Almaty and Kyzyl-Orda Oblasts (i.e., the southern arid zone: desert and steppe semi-desert ecosystems) of the country. Support is needed to change existing patterns of land use and improve land conditions by strengthening agricultural financial mechanisms and the current land-use planning system, which are the basic financial and administrative drivers of land use, thus addressing land degradation problems in the long term;

- b) *Sustainability* - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project, *static sustainability* which refers to the continuous flow of the same benefits to the same target groups; *dynamic sustainability* use and/or adaptation of the projects' results by original target groups and/or other target groups. It should include a comparison of the baseline assessment of the CD Scorecard with the terminal assessment, and make some inferences as to what contribution(s) the project has made towards institutionalizing the capacities developed;
- c) *Contribution to capacity development* - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions (municipalities) to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects' results;
- d) *Replication* – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region, outlining of possible funding sources; replication to date without direct intervention of the project;
- e) *Synergies* with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

Besides, the evaluation should also consider a below criteria for evaluations as stated in the latest GEF guidelines for TE:

At minimum:

- i. Relevance
- ii. Effectiveness
- iii. Efficiency
- iv. Gender and human rights
- v. Additional cross-cutting issues, as relevant: persons with disabilities, vulnerable groups, poverty and environment nexus, disaster risk reduction, climate change mitigation and adaptation)
- vi. Results Framework
- vii. Progress to Impact
- viii. M&E Design and Implementation
- ix. UNDP oversight/implementation
- x. Implementing Partner execution
- xi. GEF additionality
- xii. Adaptive Management
- xiii. Stakeholder Engagement
- xiv. Finance & materialization of co-financing
- xv. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

In addition to a descriptive assessment, criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory with an explanation of the rating. Also, the Overall Rating of the project should be indicated. Criteria, which have to be rated are indicated in the evaluation report outline attached in Annex 2.

Issues of special consideration:

The Evaluation will review and assess changes in development conditions, by addressing the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

- 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 (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- 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, considered 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 terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects.<sup>12</sup>
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP and/or the Government, highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

#### **4. Products expected from the Evaluation**

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should follow minimum GEF requirements as indicated in Annex 2. The Report of the Final Evaluation will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to the UNDP and the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The Report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project, according to the table attached in Annex 3 of this TOR. The Report will be supplemented by Rate Tables, attached in Annex 4 of this TOR. The length of the final evaluation report shall not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

#### **5. Evaluation Approach**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however, it should be made clear that the evaluation team may revise the approach as necessary in consultation with UNDP. Any changes should be in-line with best international criteria and professional norms and standards. Any modifications to the proposed approach should be explicitly approved by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based approach, using information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and stakeholders.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The evaluation will be conducted through desk review and online consultations with stakeholders by the evaluation team. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, UNDP CO, Project Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders.

The Evaluation Team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the UNDP/GEF project document ("ProDoc"), project reports – including Annual Reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that may be considered useful for

---

<sup>12</sup> [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)

evidence-based assessment. The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in Annex 5 of this Terms of Reference.

The national consultant shall follow the interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Due to COVID-19 related restrictions, the international consultant/team leader is not expected to travel to Kazakhstan or the project sites but has to rely on the data to be provided by the national consultant who is expected to visit the project sites (following all COVID-19 related SOPs). Outmost effort should be made by the evaluation team to collect all credible information, consult all relevant stakeholders (via phone, online key informant interviews etc.) to make sure the conduct and outcomes of the evaluation are not impacted.

The methodology to be used by the Evaluation Team should be presented in the report in full detail. It shall include information on:

- ♣ Documentation reviewed;
- ♣ Interviews;
- ♣ Field visits (national consultant only);
- ♣ Questionnaires;
- ♣ GEF CD Scorecard completed at the time of FE (by the Evaluation Team)
- ♣ Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

*Although the Evaluation Team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.*

The Evaluation Team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

## 6. Deliverables

Nº	Expected deliverables	Estimated duration to complete (in workdays)	Target due date	Responsible	Reviewers/ Approvers
1.	Desk review	3 workdays	25 December 2020	Project Manager, UNDP CO Evaluation Coordinator	UNDP CO DRR, GEF Portfolio Manager  UNDP/GEF RTA IRH
2.	Online briefings for evaluation team by the Project team, UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF RTA IRH	2 workdays	15 January 2021		
3.	Interviews with stakeholders, data collection, field visits to select sites*	11 workdays	30 January 2021		
4.	Presentation of preliminary findings	1 workday	5 February 2021		
5.	Submission of the draft Terminal Evaluation Report	5 workdays	20 February 2021		
6.	Validation of findings with stakeholders through	8 workdays	5 March 2021		

	circulation of the draft TE report for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms				
7.	Submission of the Final Terminal Evaluation report and its acceptance by UNDP (incorporating comments received on first draft)	5 workdays	15 March 2021		
	<b>Total effort:</b>	<b>35 workdays</b>			

\*The trips may take place only in case of COVID-19 quarantine measures absence.

## 7. Institutional arrangements

UNDP will sign the contract with the National Consultant in accordance with the approved UNDP procurement procedures for an individual contract. Payment for services will be made from the Project funds with satisfactory discharge of duties and achievement of results. The results of the work shall be approved by the UNDP DRR through UNDP CO evaluation manager (TDM) and UNDP RMA and M&E Associate.

- The Consultant will work under the direct supervision of the UNDP CO Evaluation Coordinator (TDM), with support from UNDP RMA and M&E Associate and overall guidance of UNDP DRR;
- The Consultant is responsible for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables;
- The Consultant ensures timely and rational planning, implementation of activities and achievement of results in accordance with the Terms of Reference;
- The Consultant provides the results of work in accordance with Deliverables;
- The Consultant shall provide reports in electronic form in MS Word format in English.

Prior to approval of the final report, UNDP Project Manager, in close coordination with the UNDP CO evaluation coordinator (TDM) and UNDP DRR will circulate the draft for comments to government counterparts: Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan, GEF-UNDP RTA. UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within 10 working days after receiving the draft. The finalized Terminal Evaluation Report, addressing all comments received shall be submitted by 15 March 2021.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

## 8. Duration of assignment

The Consultant is expected to devote a maximum of 35 working days over a period of 4 calendar months in December 2020 - March 2021. The assignment commences immediately after signing the contract.

### Duty Station

Home-based with two trips to Kostanay and Kyzylorda regions (29 effective person-days home based and 6 effective person-days on field missions, 3 days per each).

The trips may take place only in case of COVID-19 quarantine measures absence.

### \*Travel:

- BSAFE security course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;

- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>

#### 9. Qualification requirements

- A Master's degree (PhD preferred) in natural resources management, economics, environmental studies or other closely related field;
- 7 years of working experience in Environmental Economics, Agriculture, Sustainable Land Management, Organic Farming, financial incentives; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- At least 5 years of experience in working with development project evaluations (experience with evaluations of GEF funded projects is an advantage);
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to land desertification protection;
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based management policies and procedures;
- Recognized expertise in the Agricultural extension and sustainable land management and stakeholder involvement fields;
- Familiarity with agricultural sector, extension, legislation, policies and management structures in Kazakhstan;
- Fluent in English and Russian (both written and spoken);
- Computer literacy.

#### 10. Competencies

- Excellent analytical skills and ability to write in a concise and comprehensible manner;
- Ability to work with tight deadlines and prepare accurate and clear reports for policy makers, at a short notice;
- Ability to interact with high-level government officials; also, be able to work closely with technical experts on a day-to-day basis, as well as to provide hands-on technical assistance and knowledge transfer.

#### 11. Scope of price proposal

This is a lump sum contract, paid upon completion and certification of deliverables. The interested candidate must submit his/her financial proposal in KZT in a separate file (from other required documents to be submitted). The financial proposal should include all the expert's expenses, including daily fee, travel expenses\*\* (return tickets, DSA, terminals and etc.), and any other relevant expenses for the assignment and necessary for obtaining the above results within the Terms of Reference. Payment will be made in tranches after the approval of the report, based on the above results and the signing of the Certificate of payment for the result by the Portfolio Manager, GEF Portfolio Manager and UNDP CO DRR.

*\*Please be noted that in financial proposal the living allowances should be lower or equal to UN daily subsistence allowances, but under no circumstance should they be higher.*

#### 12. Recommended Presentation of Offer

The following documents in PDF to be attached to the Offer:

- a) Duly accomplished Offeror's Letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability for the Individual contractor (IC) assignment and Annex 2 "Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price"

using provided UNDP template; the document should be provided separately from other required documents;

- b) Detailed CV, where previous work experience in similar projects should be included, as well as contact details (email and phone number) of the Offeror;
- c) Other documents certifying the work experience, expertise, education and skills (qualification improvement certificates\diplomas, awards, etc.).

**Approved by**

Signature Zhanetta Babasheva

Zhanetta Babasheva  
UNDP Resource Mobilization Associate

Date Signed 04-Dec-2020

Signature Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov

Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov  
Programme Specialist and GEF Portfolio Manager

Date Signed 04-Dec-2020

## Annex 1. Project Results Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPAP for 2010-2015: Government, educators, communities, civil society and the academic community practice an integrated approach to natural resources management in national and transboundary perspectives
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Tools for landscape-level conservation and planning developed and integrated into the stakeholders' policies and practices
UNDP Strategic Plan <u>Primary</u> Outcome: Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Main focus is LD-3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management; Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
Objective: to transform land use practices in steppe and semi-arid zones of Kazakhstan to ensure ecological integrity, food security and sustainable livelihoods	Area of productive landscapes (pasturelands, crop and fodder production lands) in steppe and semi-arid zones under ILUPs that include a focus on maintaining ecosystem services of agricultural landscapes through SLM practices	Zero	750,000 hectares by project end (the indirect area of influence of the project is the entire agricultural landscape of the country – pasture and other agricultural lands – which totals 222.6 million ha)	Project PIR, Independent Evaluation, periodic field surveys/ visits	Political support for integrating SLM principles into the agricultural sector remains strong, facilitating further replication of SLM practices on the ground
	Improvement in % of soil humus content in area where ILUPs are in place	2% on average	8 to 10% on average	Field surveys/ visits	

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
	Improvement in livestock productivity (as measured by weight gain) in area where ILUPs are in place	Average live weight in degraded pastures/rangelands is 320 kg	20% weight gain over baseline	Field surveys/visits	
Outcome 1: Investment in integrated territorial planning and start-up of agro-environmental incentives	Indicators of on-the-ground improvements in crop and fodder productivity, soil fertility, salt content, crop rotation, efficiency in water use, etc. (indicators vary by pilot site)	See table below	See table below	Field monitoring surveys	Central and local governments show willingness to engage local stakeholders in land use planning  Climate change-induced extreme seasonal variations or emerging new threats do not affect pilot projects/ sites in ways that undermine the successes of the demonstration activities
	Access of small and medium farmers in pilot sites to agro-environmental incentives	At present, the nature of agricultural subsidies is such that they are mostly accessible only to large-scale farms	At least 40% of small and medium farms eligible for agro-environmental incentives have access to them by project end	Financial and administrative reports of akimats of target oblasts and districts	
	Successful training program run by affiliates of KazAgroMarketing and KazAgroInnovation for small and medium farms on sustainable crop and forage production and livestock breeding	Training does not adequately cover needs of small and medium farms	At least 75% of small and medium farms in areas where training is delivered send representatives to attend sessions by project end	Training records; training evaluations	Building of sufficient capacity and practical know-how within essential state institutions and local authorities does not take too long allowing for project sustainability
	Successful training program on SLM run by KazAgroInnovation for akimat staff from land relations and agricultural	No such targeted training program	80% of target audience attend sessions by project end	Training records; training evaluations	

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
	departments in areas where pilot projects are to take place <sup>13</sup>				
	Higher education institutions producing graduates with sound understanding of SLM practices in the agriculture sector and distant rangeland management	Current national and regional higher education institutions are producing limited number of professionals with such training and skills	At least 2 institutions <sup>14</sup> have strengthened curriculums by project end	Curriculums, survey of students and graduates, PIR, terminal report.	
Outcome 2: Enabling policy environment for integrated land use planning and agro-environmental incentives	Inter-agency mechanism for ensuring coordination of integrated land use planning and agro-environmental incentives operating effectively	Does not exist	Inter-agency Working Group has a clear mandate and method of operation to ensure coordination of different land use sectors by project end	Minutes of WG, Project PIRs, Terminal report	Current political commitment to agro-environmental incentives continues to grow  Legislative changes required to realize the project objective are agreed to and carried through in a timely manner
	Inclusion of agro-environmental subsidies in State programs	Agro-environmental subsidies do not exist	Agribusiness 2020 program includes such subsidies	Government reports on Agribusiness 2020 program	
	Increase in government financing for SLM practices	No existing subsidies that are 100% SLM related	20% of total agricultural subsidies are agro-environmental or green subsidies, 10 years after the agro-environmental scheme is up and running	Government budget (ag. subsidy budget line)	

<sup>13</sup> Balkhash and Enbekshikazakh districts of Almaty Oblast, Karabulak rural okrug and Akkol district of Akmola Oblast, Ayyagoz district of East-Kazakhstan Oblast, Denisovsky and Fedorovsky districts of Kostanai Oblast, Kzyl Orda City of Kzyl Orda Oblast, Akkaiyn district of North Kazakhstan Oblast

<sup>14</sup> Kostanai State University (KSU) and Kazakh National Agriculture University (KazNAU)

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
	Amendments to existing policies, regulations, and rules such that the support for SLM is stronger	There are weaknesses in a number of existing policies, rules and regulations	At least 7 types <sup>15</sup> of amendments are developed	Official ordinances (for new laws), approvals from designated ministries (for amendments)	

<sup>15</sup> (1) Agro-environmental measures applicable to Kazakhstan: targeted biotopes, eligible beneficial land uses and associated regimes, subsidy rates per ha, administration of subsidies and monitoring checklists; (2) amendments to the Land Code on regulating rangelands and pastures, including ownership rights for pastures and hayfields around settlements; (3) amendments to the Land Code on land use planning; (4) changes to by-laws regulating land use issues to include the definition of rational use and its criteria; (5) amendments to the Rules on Rational Land Use related to social and ecosystem dimensions of sustainable land use and non-compliance with the requirements of land use planning; (6) amendments to the Tax Code on privileges for compliance with the SLM requirements for land users, and to the Administrative Code on non-compliance with the SLM requirements by land users and failure to enforce compliance on part of land monitoring authorities; (7) proposals to the draft Law on Organic Agriculture.

## Annex 2. Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

### Minimum GEF requirements<sup>1</sup>

#### Executive summary

- ♣ Brief description of project
- ♣ Context and purpose of the evaluation
- ♣ Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

#### Introduction

- ♣ Purpose of the evaluation
- ♣ Key issues addressed
- ♣ Methodology of the evaluation
- ♣ Structure of the evaluation

#### The project(s) and its development context

- ♣ Project start and its duration
- ♣ Problems that the project seek to address
- ♣ Immediate and development objectives of the project
- ♣ Main stakeholders
- ♣ Results expected

#### Findings and Conclusions

*(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) should be rated<sup>16</sup>)*

##### 0 Project formulation

- Implementation approach (\*) (i)
- Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Country ownership/Driveness
- Replication approach
- Cost-effectiveness
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

##### 0 Implementation

- Implementation approach (\*) (ii)
- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- ♣ Financial Planning

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to GEF guidelines for explanation of Terminology

<sup>16</sup> The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

- ♣ Monitoring and evaluation (\*)
- ♣ Execution and implementation modalities
- ♣ Management by the UNDP country office
- ♣ Coordination and operational issues

#### 0 Results

- ♣ Attainment of objectives (\*)
- ♣ Sustainability (\*)
- ♣ Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

#### Recommendations

- ♣ Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- ♣ Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- ♣ Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

#### Lessons learned

- ♣ Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

#### Annexes

- ♣ TE TOR
- ♣ Itinerary
- ♣ List of persons interviewed
- ♣ Summary of field visits
- ♣ List of documents reviewed
- ♣ TE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- ♣ Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- ♣ Ratings Scales
- ♣ TE mission itinerary
- ♣ List of persons interviewed
- ♣ List of documents reviewed
- ♣ Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- ♣ Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- ♣ Signed TE final report clearance form
- ♣ Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft TE report

#### Annex 2b. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- ♣ The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- ♣ Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- ♣ Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation

- ♣ Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- ♣ Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- ♣ Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- ♣ Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- ♣ The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- ♣ The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives
- ♣ Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- ♣ Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- ♣ Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- ♣ Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision-making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- ♣ Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- ♣ Fulfilment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- ♣ Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- ♣ Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- ♣ Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.

- ♣ Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- ♣ Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- ♣ Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).
- ♣ Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- ♣ Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- ♣ Achieving stakeholder's consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- ♣ Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- ♣ Expansion of demonstration projects.
- ♣ Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- ♣ Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- ♣ Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing<sup>17</sup>.
- ♣ Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- ♣ Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

*Co-financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

---

<sup>17</sup> Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- ♣ Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- ♣ The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- ♣ The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

## Annex 3. Co-financing Table

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Loans										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments *										
Other Types										
<b>TOTAL</b>										

- Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.
- “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):
  - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash/purpose.*
- Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:
  - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash*
  - ...
  - ...

#### Annex 4. Rate tables

Table 1 : Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY*	RATING**
Objective :				
OUTCOMES		END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
Outcome 1:				
Outcome 2:				
Outcome 3:				
Outcome 4:				
Outcome 5:				

\* *Status of delivery colouring codes:*

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement

Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

\*\* Rating:

Highly Satisfactory = HS

Satisfactory = S

Marginally Satisfactory = MS

Unsatisfactory = U

Table 2: Project ratings

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE						RATING
	HU	U	MU	MS	S	HS	
<b>PROJECT FORMULATION</b>							
Conceptualization/Design							
Stakeholder participation							
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>							
Implementation Approach							
The use of the logical framework							
Adaptive management							
Use/establishment of information technologies							
Operational relationships between the institutions involved							
Technical capacities							
Monitoring and evaluation							
Stakeholder participation							
Production and dissemination of information							
Local resource users and NGOs participation							
Establishment of partnerships							
Involvement and support of governmental institutions							
<b>PROJECT RESULTS</b>							
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives							
Achievement of objective							
Outcome 1							
Outcome 2							
Outcome 3							
Outcome 4							
Outcome 5							
Outcome 6							
Outcome 7							
<b>OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT &amp; IMPACT</b>							

**Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluation Team**

The following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

Document	Description
Project document	Project Document
Project reports	PIF UNDP Initiation Plan UNDP Project Document UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams AWP's Consultant's reports and publications SC meeting minutes
Annual Project Reports to GEF	PIR 2016 PIR 2017, PIR 2018, PIR 2019.
Other relevant materials:	Project key document outputs Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems UNDP country/countries programme document(s) Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) Project site location maps

**Annex 6. Cost breakdown template**

	Units*	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office			
Desk review			
Briefings by UNDP and PM			
Drafting of the evaluation report			
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms			
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)			
Work on mission			
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings			
Sub-total fee			
Travel costs			
Local travel (to be arranged and covered by the project)			
DSA (overnights)			
Sub-total travel costs			
<b>TOTAL</b>			

\* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.