

TERMS OF REFERENCE

International Consultant

for

Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project

“Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investments for Sustainable Land Management”

1. Introduction

Standard UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation requirements

This Mid Term Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Turkmenistan as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Turkmenistan Country Office and UNDP/GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project’s expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy:

<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>

and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy:

<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- (i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- (ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- (iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
- (iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A combination of tools should be used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, PIRs, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term review, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedures the mid-term evaluation is recommended for all the projects with a long term of implementation or those at critical stage of implementation. In addition to the fact that said evaluation enables to gain an independent deep view of the progress attained, such assessment meets GEF Council decisions in respect of transparency and improvement of access to information at the stage of implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. Such evaluation is expected to serve a tool to recognize or bridge the gaps in the primary assessment of relevance, effectiveness and cost-efficiency as gained from the monitoring exercise. The mid-term evaluation enables to assess the primary signs of the project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The mid-term evaluation shall be performed by an independent expert unrelated to the project development or implementation.

The evaluation will play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on: (i) how to strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project; (ii) how to ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective; (iii) how to enhance organizational and development learning; and (iv) how to enable informed decision – making.

The evaluation will have to provide to the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The consultant should prepare specific ratings on seven aspects of the project, as described in the 'Reporting' section of this Terms of Reference. Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving the objective and outcomes in the established timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding.

Project Goal, Objective and Outcomes

The long term perspective of the project is to overcome the existing inconsistencies and disconnections between the policy framework for land management and actual needs of land users by initiating a participatory dialogue with involvement of the key ministries, local government and local land users. This will create an enabling environment for improvement of land use and for investment in SLM. An important document that sets the framework for more investment in SLM and participatory land management and which identifies the priorities in the management of land resources is the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification.

The objective of the project is to improve the capacity of land users for sustainable management of their land resources. The project will concentrate on improving the technical know-how of land users, on stabilizing soil productivity in the project area, on a stronger participation of land users in decision making and on a better self-organization and cooperation particularly of the local stakeholders.

The Main Project Expected Outcomes are as Follows:

Outcome 1

Land users have stronger capacities for SLM.

Capacity building for stakeholders at the local level will aim at improving the technical capacity of land users which they need to participate in integrated land use planning, and to adopt innovative and alternative land management. It will also improve the degree of self-organization of land users as a prerequisite for Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP). Capacity building will also include local administration.

Outcome 2

Best land use practices have been developed in three project sites.

With assistance of the project the on-the-ground investment is planned in forest protection, reforestation of local species, rehabilitation of indigenous Juniperus forest, planting of poplars for construction wood, construction of water catchments and check dams, improved pasture management, and rehabilitation of salinized soils, fixation and afforestation of shifting sands.

Incentives for better land management at local level will be identified by the project. PLUP will be tested in three sites of the project area. All results will be recorded and proposed for replication in other regions of the country.

Outcome 3

Improved knowledge basis for SLM exists in three project sites.

Systematic field trials will furnish detailed information on methods of management and improvement of pasture, on water harvesting in conjunction with erosion control, on forest protection and reforestation, and on soil fertility and restoration of salinized land. These trials will

be carried out in partnership with local land users and they will facilitate the adoption of innovative sustainable land management practices and technologies.

Outcomes 1-3 will benefit from the experience and the results already available from the ongoing GTZ-CCD/NIDFF pilot project “Combating Land Degradation in Three Regions of Turkmenistan”.

Outcome 4

Stronger institutional and policy framework for SLM.

Stronger participation of all stakeholders in land conservation activities will be ensured through catalyzing the potential of the existing national institutions and through improved communication and information flow between the stakeholders.

The project will support the revision process of the NAP. The NAP will be revised as a result of consultation with all stakeholders concerned. The revised NAP will outline strategic approaches in combating desertification in line with existing national development programs such as the National Environmental Action Plan (2002) and the national program “Strategy of Economic, Political and Cultural Development of Turkmenistan till the year 2020”, in order to facilitate mainstreaming of SLM into the national development strategies. It should also become a strategic instrument for decision making on investment in land use and land management at the local level and should prepare the ground for Local Action Programs (LAP).

The activities under outcome 4 will benefit from the process and results of the joint project of UNDP and Ministry of Nature Protection “National Capacity Self-Assessment” (NCSA).

Outcome 5:

Adaptive management and learning introduced for sustainability of project results.

In the context of development and constantly changing situation, principles of adaptive management and learning will be introduced to the project in order to ensure that the outcomes and outputs of the project remain sound, vital and beneficial. This is as well essential to assure the sustainability of the project outcomes in the long-term run.

Adaptive management is instrumental in delivering quality monitoring and evaluation exercises, capturing lessons learned and best practices for further replication at the national, regional and international level.

Project Beneficiaries:

- Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP),
- Ministry of Agriculture (MA),
- Ministry of Water Economy (MWE),
- Land Resources Service at the Ministry of Agriculture
- Gengeshis or Local Administrations for the Three Pilot Sites

2. Objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The evaluation is focused on a comprehensive project assessment and enables to make a critical evaluation of administrative and technical strategies, problems and restrictions associated with the large-scale international and multilateral initiatives. The evaluation shall also provide the recommendations in relation to the strategies, approaches and/or activities in order to enhance the project capacities of achieving the expected outcomes. The evaluation results will be incorporated in the recommendations to improve the implementation of a given project stage in the forthcoming years.

Purpose:

- (i) To evaluate the overall project activities in relation to the objectives and expected outcomes as stated in the project document and the other related documents

- (ii) To evaluate the project effectiveness and cost-efficiency
- (iii) To critically analyze the arrangements of project management and implementation
- (iv) To evaluate the progress attained so far in relation to the project outcomes
- (v) To investigate the strategies and plans intended for the timely achievement of the overall project goal
- (vi) To list and document the first lessons learned in respect of the project design, its implementation and management
- (vii) To assess the sustainability of project interventions;
- (viii) To assess the relevance in relation to the national priorities
- (ix) To provide the recommendations for the future project activities and, where necessary, for the project implementation and management arrangements.

In particular, the mid-term evaluation exercise will assess the progress of creating the basic information, alleviation of threats and identification of any constraints to the project implementation and their causes. It intends also to provide the recommendations for corrective measures to be undertaken. An effective measure to correct the problem areas identified, constraining the project implementation, will be required before the decision to be made in relation to the project continuation.

The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework (see Annex 2). Many of these indicators relate to the impact/implementation that will be applied in the impact assessment. The success and failure will partially be determined through the monitoring of the relative changes within the baseline conditions developed within one year of the project implementation. Where possible, the indicator species, sensitive to the changes of habitat and pressure increase, will need to be identified and monitored. In case of an identified shrinkage of the population of rare and endangered species the measures will be undertaken to identify the causes of such shrinkage and the alternative strategies will be developed to ensure the long-term welfare of the populations that will further be incorporated in the overall project site management.

The mid-term evaluation report shall be a separate document which will contain the recommendations and conclusions.

The report will be intended to meet the needs of all the related parties (GEF, UNDP, GTZ the project's National Steering Committee, local communities and other related parties in Turkmenistan and foreign countries).

3. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation exercise will embrace the project elements as follows:

Project concept and design: The evaluator will assess the project concept and design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation: The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation. The evaluation exercise will measure the level of achievement of the project's objective. It will also identify which interim results have been achieved and how they have contributed to meeting the ultimate project outcomes. This section will be focused on the priority areas as follows:

Project outputs, outcomes and impact: The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the outcomes and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

Project Management and Administration: The evaluation should collect, document and assess the relevant elements and processes including: (i) Administrative procedures related to the project; (ii) Key decisions and interim results; and (iii) The main project implementation documents specifying how useful have the documents and reports been

Project Execution: The evaluation should assess the quality of services provided by MNP acting as the Implementing Agency (within the national UNDP execution) and PIU (project management cost-efficiency including the achievement of interim results in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness; and the monitoring system)

The Mid-term Evaluation will also cover the following aspects:

3.1. Progress towards Results

Changes in development conditions. Address the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

- (i) Have the land use planning and management practices been improved as targeted by the project?
- (ii) Have there been changes in local stakeholder behaviour (i.e. reduction of threats) that have contributed to improved management? If not, why not?
- (iii) Is there distinct improvement in SLM information turnover and use in decision making among stakeholders?
- (iv) Has awareness on land management and subsequent public participation in land use planning, monitoring and management increased as a result of the project?

Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the project site to conditions in similar unmanaged sites.

Project strategy: how and why outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

Sustainability: to which extent the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the local economy, etc.

3.2. Adaptive management framework of the project

Monitoring Systems.

- a) Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
 - Do they provide the necessary information?
 - Do they involve key partners?
 - Are they efficient?
 - Are additional tools required?

- b) Reconstruct baseline data if necessary¹. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise²;
- c) Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements³. Apply SMART indicators as necessary;
- d) Apply the GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with the baseline values.

Risk Management

- a) Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted;
- b) Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
 - Is the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System⁴ appropriately applied?
 - How can the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?

Work Planning

- a) Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it:
 - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content;
 - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?
- b) Assess the use of routinely updated work plans;
- c) Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- d) Are work planning processes result-based⁵? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;
- e) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

Reporting

- a) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;
- b) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3.3. Underlying Factors

- a) Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors;
- b) Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made;
- c) Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

3.4. UNDP Contribution

¹ See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

² See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

³ See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

⁴ UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XI at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

⁵ RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

- a) Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider: field visits; Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis; PIR preparation and follow-up; GEF guidance;
- b) Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide⁶, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework;
- c) Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

3.5. Partnership Strategy

- a) Assess how partners are involved in the project's adaptive management framework:
 - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance;
 - Using already existing data and statistics;
 - Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
- b) Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
- c) Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
- d) Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms;
- e) Assess collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;
- f) Assess collaboration between implementation units of other related projects;
- g) Assess local partnerships;
- h) Assess transfer of capacity to the national institutions.

3.6. Project Finance

- a) Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions, taking into account the project activity timeframe;
- b) Review the effectiveness of financial coordinating mechanisms.

4. Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is:

The Mid-term Evaluation Report

The mid-term evaluation report will include:

- The facts and conclusions identified in respect of the issues to be reviewed in accordance with The Scope of Evaluation section
- Evaluation of project impact on:
 - The institution assisted and its staff;
 - The final beneficiaries including specific groups;
- Project sustainability on the basis of:
 - The commitments of the governmental agencies in relation to the project objectives
 - Involvement of local organizations (participatory process)
 - Management and organizational factors
 - Financing

⁶ The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>

- Staff development
- Recommendations for the future implementation of the project activities
- Lessons learned

The draft and final report will be prepared in the format as provided in Annex 1 hereto. The draft report will be presented to UNDP/GEF not later than 30 April 2010. The final report will be prepared on the basis of the comments to be obtained from the parties related. The deadline for the final report is 15 May 2010.

The report will be presented electronically and in hard copy, in English, and will be translated into Russian for distribution to national counterparts.

5. Evaluation Approach

The Mid-Term Evaluation will be done through a combination of processes including a desk study, site visits, questionnaires and interviews, with involvement of all the parties related but not limited by: MNP, UNDP, GTZ, representatives of the governmental agencies of various levels, local authorities, communities etc.

The evaluation team will be governed by the materials that available at: www.undp.org/gef as follows:

- UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
- UNDP/GEF M&E Resource Kit
- Measuring Results of the GEF Land Management Program

The evaluation methodology is assumed to cover the aspects as follows:

- Desk study of all project documentation
- Consultations with MNP, UNDP, GTZ
- Field visits (Ashgabat, project sites)
- Interviews with related parties
 - MNP, its territorial departments and SPA's
 - Local authorities
 - Local communities

6. Evaluation Expert

The Mid-term Evaluation will be carried out by one international consultant:

- International consultant - expert in areas of international projects' monitoring and evaluation with the focus on land use planning and management, combating land desertification and degradation, sustainable livelihoods, participatory approaches;

Qualities:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
- Recognized expertise in the land use planning and management;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported land management related projects;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Excellent English communication skills.

Specifically, the international expert will perform the following tasks:

- undertake and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for a position.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the SLM project policy-making process and/or its implementation. Any previous association with the project, Ministry of Nature Protection and its affiliates in the project sites, UNDP Turkmenistan or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products.

7. Implementation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Turkmenistan. It is the main operational point responsible for liaising with the project team to set up interviews with stakeholder, arrange field visits and co-ordinate with the Executing Agency and other counterparts. UNDP Turkmenistan will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation.

The timeframe for submission of the first draft of the report: 7 weeks upon signing the Contract. The report will be submitted both electronically and in printed version, in English.

The report should be submitted to UNDP Country Office in Turkmenistan (to the attention of Mr. Rovshen Nurmuhamedov, mailing address: 40 Galkynysh St., Ashgabat, Turkmenistan; Tel.: +99312425250, email: Rovshen.nurmuhamedov@undp.org

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts and the members of the project steering group: UNDP, GTZ, National Project Coordinator, NCC members, members representing various organizations.

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.

The activities and timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Timeframes and responsibilities
Desk review	3 days – international expert
Field visits, interviews, questionnaire, debriefing Briefing of evaluation consultants	10 days – international expert
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings, and other types of feedback mechanisms	4 days – international expert
Preparation of final evaluation report (including comments)	5 days – international expert

Working days:

International expert – 22 working days

The process should commence no later than 10 March 2010.

HOW TO APPLY

All interested candidates should send their detailed CVs to **UN Turkmenistan Registry** at registry.tm@undp.org (with the vacancy title stated in the e.mail message subject) in copy (cc:) to djemshid.khadjiyev@undp.org, Programme Assistant for Environment and Energy, **OR** send in a sealed envelope stating the title of the vacancy by **COB 24 February 2010** to the following address: UN House, 40 Galkynysh Street, 744013, Ashgabat, Turkmenistan.

For general information about UNDP Turkmenistan activities please visit:
<http://www.undptkm.org>

Annex 1: The Structure of Mid-term Evaluation Report

Executive Summary

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

Introduction

- Project background
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- The outputs of the evaluation and how they will be used
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The Project and its Development Context

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

Findings and Conclusions

- Project Formulation
 - Implementation approach
 - Country ownership
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- Implementation
 - Supervision of the project implementation
 - Project execution
 - Project implementation
 - Project Administration
 - Planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Risk management
 - Coordination and operational issues
- Project Financial Management
 - Financial planning
 - Budgetary procedures
 - Expenditures
 - Efficiency of financing mechanism
 - Risks
- Results
 - **Attainment of objectives**
 - **Prospects of sustainability**

Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons Learned (at least 5 pages of very clear analysis of lessons learned)

- Best and worst practices in addressing the issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

Annexes

- ToR
- Evaluation Program
- The list of people interviewed
- Summary of site visit
- The list of documents reviewed
- The questionnaire used and brief summary of results

Other Materials

Annex 2. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

Following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project (titles underlined are available in Russian with an English annotation):

Document	Description
Project document	The Project Document and Revisions
Project reports	Project Inception Report Annual Progress Reports
Annual Project Report to GEF	Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs)
Minutes	Steering group meetings Meetings with experts, team staff etc.

ANNEX 3. Rate tables.

Goal: Living conditions of local people improved				
Objective of the project: Land use improved towards more sustainability				
Outcome 1 ("Training"): Land users have stronger capacities for SLM (knowledge and organisation)	Outcome 2 ("Investments"): Land use practises improved in three project sites	Outcome 3 ("Research"): Improved knowledge basis for SLM exists in three project sites	Outcome 4 ("Policy framework"): Stronger institutional and policy framework for SLM	Outcome 5 (Management): Adaptive management and learning introduced (for sustainability of the project results)
Output 1.1: Technical know-how of local land users is improved Output 1.2: Participatory land use planning adapted and in function Output 1.3: Knowledge and know-how disseminated to stakeholders for replication	Outputs Nohur 2.1. Better pasture management introduced 2.2 Water retention assured 2.3 Vegetable gardening extended 2.4 Afforestation extended Outputs Bahardok 2.5 Better pasture management introduced	Output 3.1: A need-oriented program for trials and targeted research elaborated in partnership with land users Output 3.2: Applied research work implemented successfully Output 3.3: Results of applied research available for interested stakeholders Output 3.4:	Output 4.1: Recommendations elaborated for the revision of the NAP Output 4.2: Local Action Programs are elaborated and accepted as basis for improved land management at local level Output 4.3: Recommendations forwarded to the NSEC of CACILM for the amendment of the legal framework governing SLM	Output 5.1: Outputs and activities regularly scrutinised and adapted if necessary Output 5.2: Project's performance monitored and evaluated. Output 5.3: Project results and lessons learnt disseminated for replication (regional and national level) Output 5.4:

	<p>2.6 Dune fixation around settlements</p> <p>2.7 Alternative energies for heating purposes supported</p> <p>Outputs Sakar Chaga</p> <p>2.8 Better drainage and irrigation techniques introduced (prevention of degradation)</p> <p>2.9 Better drainage and irrigation techniques introduced (rehabilitation)</p> <p>2.10 Viniculture rehabilitation and development in wastelands proposed</p> <p>2.11 Dissemination of diversified gardening techniques</p>	<p>Thorough and participatory analysis of the various ecosystem services and functions in the 3 pilot sites</p>		<p>Project units established in the three project sites</p> <p>Output 5.5:</p> <p>Internal rules and regulations elaborated for the coordination between all actors of the project</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fulfilment of the agreements for protection of the reforested areas is kept effectively (Nohur). • The land users are ready to reduce the number of their animals, if they have other sources of income as compensation (Nohur). 		<p>The stakeholders at the national level have an interest in mainstreaming SLM into policy making and development programs and in a revised NAP.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a risk that the short leasing time of land is a disincentive for private investments (Sakar Chaga). 			
--	--	--	--	--

Indicator Matrix SLM Turkmenistan, 2008 – 2010

5/30/2008

No.	Designation of Impact/Result	Indicators (with numbering)	Base line value	Target value	Methods and pace of data collection	Responsible for data collection
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Goal	Living conditions of local people improved	No indicator suggested here: eventual indicators need unacceptable efforts and will be still inaccurate. It is not possible to attribute a change in such eventual indicators to the activities and efforts of the project.				
Objective of the project:	Land use improved towards more sustainability	(1) Erosion coefficient in Nohur	2008 Heavily degraded: % 2008 Degraded: % 2008 Les degraded: % 2008 Not degraded: %	2010 Heavily degraded: % 2010 Degraded: % 2010 Les degraded: % 2010 Not degraded: %	GIS survey (Landsat photographs 1990, satellite photographs 2008 and ? 2010)	PM with national and international consultants
		(2) Vegetation cover in Karakum	2008 Heavily degraded: % 2008 Degraded: % 2008 Les degraded: % 2008 Not degraded: %	2010 Heavily degraded: % 2010 Degraded: % 2010 Les degraded: % 2010 Not degraded: %	GIS survey (Landsat photographs 1990, satellite photographs 2008 and ? 2010)	PM with national and international consultants
		(3) Production of cotton t/ha production of wheat t/ha (Use of fertilizer, pesticides, insecticides, herbicides in Sakar Chaga?)	2003 and 2005 and 2007: x t/ha wheat, y t/ha of cotton	2008 and 2009 and 2010: x t/ha wheat, y t/ha of cotton	Yearly	LPM Sakar Chaga
Outcome 1 (Training)	Land users have stronger capacities for SLM	(4) Minutes of regular meetings of three local steering committees	No minutes so far	Each meeting will have its minutes	The local steering committees will decide upon the pace of their meetings.	Three LPM; PM and TA for analysis
Output 1.1	Technical know-how of local land users is improved	No indicator suggested here: an eventual indicator needs unacceptable efforts to be followed up				

Output 1.2	Local stakeholders enabled to elaborate Local Land Use Plans	(5) Local land use plans agreed upon by local steering committees	Local land use se plans available but needing updates with a participatory approach	3 plans available and agreed upon by the respective steering committee until 3/2010	Intermediate steps and agreements until the elaboration of a land use plan	PM and respective LPM
Output 1.3	Knowledge and know-how disseminated to stakeholders for replication	(6) Awareness of relevant stakeholders in other (adjacent) areas about the information disseminated	No information material available	Reports, manuals, eventually visits to the project areas	Survey by a student on the impact of the information disseminated (2010)	PM and the TA
Outcome 2 (Investments)	Land use practises improved in three project sites	See indicators 1, 2 and 3 (Objective of the project)				
Outputs	2.1 Better pasture management introduced	(7) Number of small ruminants in the Farmer's Association (FA) "Yengish" (9.000 ha)	2003: ? 2007: 25.000 Small ruminants	2009: 20.000 ? 2010: 15.000 ?	Yearly survey in Mai	Local Project Manager Nohur (LPM)
	Nohur 2.2 Water retention assured	(8) Water (m³) retained by all dams in the FA "Yengish" (9.000 ha) in m³ in spring and in summer in relation to precipitations	2008 spring: ? m³ 2008 summer: ? m³	2009 spring ? m³ 2009 summer ? m³ 2010 spring ? m³ 2010 summer ? m³	2 measurements per year in all dams of the areas	Local Project Manager Nohur (LPM)
Continuation: Outputs Nohur	2.3 Vegetable gardening extended	(9) Value (TMM) of vegetable and fruit production in the FA "Yengish" and number of households involved	2008 Value: ? TMM No. of households: ?	2009 Value ? 2010 Value ?	Survey after harvest in summer and in winter of each year	Project headquarter, assistance of LPM Nohur
	2.4 Afforestation extended	(10) Area (ha) afforested with juniperus outside settlements (FA "Yengish")	2007: 0 ha	2008: 20 ha new 2009: 20 ha, 75% success; 40 ha new. 2010: 20 ha 70% success; 40 ha 75 % success; 40 ha new	Yearly (photo-) survey of the total afforested area	Project headquarter, assistance of LPM Nohur
Outputs Karakum	2.5 Better pasture management introduced	(11) Number of small ruminants per well (30 wells, FA "Karakum") A category "Heavily degraded" (> 3.000 heads) B category "Degraded" (1.500 to 3.000 heads) C category "Sustainable" (up to 1.500 heads)	2008 A category: ? B category ? C category 0	2009 2010 A category: ? ? B category: ? ? C category: ? ?	Survey in FA "Karakum" on a sample of wells in spring and in autumn each year	Project headquarter, assistance of LPM Karakum
	2.6 Dune fixation around settlements	(12) Fixed and afforested dune area (ha) in the FA "Karakum" and number of thus protected houses in 10 settlements (approximately one ha will protect one house)	2007: 27 ha, 15 houses + cemetery + hospital + 2 schools protected	2008/09: 67 ha for 40 houses 2009/10: 147 ha 2010: 227 ha	Measurements in the settlements once a year in summer time	Local Project Manager Karakum

	2.7 Alternative energies for heating purposes supported	(13) Saxaul (lorry loads of fuel) consumption by Bahardok school	2007: 50 loads	2008: 50 lorries 2009: Saxaul fuel replaced by diesel	Information provided by the school	Local Project Manager Karakum
Outputs Sakar Chaga	2.8 Better drainage and irrigation techniques introduced (prevention of degradation)	(14) Soil salinity of 624 ha (FA "Zahmet"'s area) according to the international classification in 4 categories	7/2007: Category 1: 474 ha Category 2: 85 ha Category 3: 65 ha	10/2010: Category 1: 547 ha Category 2: 77 ha	Measurements in April and September of each year	Local Project Manager Sakar Chaga
	2.9 Better drainage and irrigation techniques introduced (rehabilitation)	(15) Soil salinity on 50 ha (FA "Zahmet"'s area) according to the international classification in 4 categories	7/2007: Category 4: 50 ha	10/2010: Category 1: 25 ha Category 2: 25 ha	Measurements in April and September of each year	Local Project Manager Sakar Chaga
	2.10 Viniculture rehabilitation and development in wastelands proposed	(16) Production of table grapes in t/ha (on 5 ha of the area of the FA "Zahmet")	2007 13 t/ha on degraded land	2008: ? kg/ha 2009: ? kg/ha 2010 ? kg/ha	One survey in autumn of each year	Local Project Manager Sakar Chaga
	2.11 Dissemination of diversified gardening techniques	(17) Households using at least one of the newly disseminated gardening techniques (compost, green house and others)	2007: 7 % of all 1.700 households of the FA "Zahmet"	12/2008: 10 % 12/2009 ? % 10/2010 ? %	Survey in June/July of each year	Local Project Manager Sakar Chaga
				12/2009: 25 %		
				10/2010: 50 %		
Risks	R1: The fulfilment of the agreements for protection of the reforested areas is kept effectively (Nohur).	see indicator 10				
	R 2: The land users are ready to reduce the number of their animals, if they have other sources of income as compensation (Nohur, Karakum).	see indicator 7				
	R 3: There is a risk that the short leasing time of land is a disincentive for private investments (Sakar Chaga).	(18) Decree governing the leasing time of agricultural land in Sakar Chaga	At present: one year leasing time. Test going on in Sakar Chaga.	At least 12 years leasing time.	Observe the development of the respective decree	PM
Outcome 3 (Research)	Improved knowledge basis for SLM exists in three project sites	(19) Content and topics of the Local Action Plans	Former research results are implemented (afforestation, dune fixation, green house, bio humus) at the local level	Local Action Plans reflect the results of the project research	Verification in the Local Action Plans, at the end of the project phase	PM, PA, national consultants

Output 3.1	A need-oriented programme for trials and targeted research elaborated in partnership with land users	(20) Document specifying topics, responsibilities, timeframe and budget of the research	List of topics is proposed	Programme covering the whole project period will be available until 09-2008		PM, TA and national consultants
Output 3.2	Applied research work implemented successfully	(21) Summarising reports with recommendations available and evaluated positively by third parties	Research reports available from the GTZ - NIDFF project	Subject and number of research reports to be defined 09-2008	Half yearly short progress reports available for each topic	Project administrator and national consultants
Output 3.3	Results of applied research available for interested stakeholders	(22) Presentation and publishing of research results to concerned stakeholders	15 leaflets, 1 video and three brochures of the predecessor project	1 leaflet per project site per year and one round-table meeting	Yearly	Project administrator and national consultants
Output 3.4	Thorough and participatory analysis of the various ecosystem services and functions in the 3 pilot sites	No indicator formulated				
Outcome 4 (Policy framework)	Stronger institutional and policy framework for SLM	No indicator formulated				
Output 4.1	Recommendations elaborated for the revision of the NAP	(23) Written proposals for modifications of the National Action Programme (NAP CCD)	Existing NAP	NAP is in line with the National Strategic programme up to 2030	Recommendations ready by June 2009	National consultants
Output 4.2	Local Action Programs are elaborated and accepted as basis for improved land management at local level	See indicator 4				
Output 4.3	Recommendations forwarded to the NSEC of CACILM for the amendment of the legal framework governing SLM	(24) Proposals submitted by a consultant team and commented by a third party	Existing legal framework governing SLM	SLM better protected and promoted by the legal framework	Recommendations ready by October 2009	Who can do this?
Risk	R 4: The stakeholders at the national level have an interest in mainstreaming SLM into policy making and development programs and in a revised NAP.	(25) National policy of meat production as indicated in the National Strategic Development programme 2030.	At present the national policy aims at increasing the number of animals	Target is to decrease the actual number of animals in the light of the natural resources available	Scrutinising the National Programme and the statistics of the Ministry of Agriculture	PM
Outcome 5 (Management)	Adaptive management and learning introduced	(26) Decentralisation and delegation of power (steady learning by doing)	Rather centralised, partly not clearly elaborated yet	LPM take over responsibility and are working on their own		PM

Output 5.1	Outputs and activities regularly scrutinised and adapted if necessary	(27) Quarterly reports to the project steering committee including the revised work plans	Work plan 2008 and plan for the first quarter 2008	Annual work plans 2009 and 2010 as well as quarterly plans	Team meetings	Project administrator
Output 5.2	Project's performance monitored and evaluated.	(28) Evaluation by external expert(s) towards the end of the project phase	Evaluation report of 2-2007	Evaluation report 6-2010	Report of independent evaluator(s)	PM, UNDP and GTZ
Output 5.3	Project results and lessons learnt disseminated for replication (regional and national level)	(29) Contributions to different web sites, leaflets for each project site, video	15 leaflets, 1 video and three brochures of the predecessor project	1 leaflet per project site per year and 1 video	Scenario and article writing, editing and publishing	Project administrator
Output 5.4	Project units established in the three project sites	(30) Project offices and personal in place	Three local contact persons, no offices	Three employed LPM and support staff, offices equipped with necessary machines, including telephones, computers	Functioning by July 2008	Project administrator
Output 5.5.	Internal rules and regulations elaborated for the coordination between all actors of the project	(31) Rules and regulations exist in a written form. Financial and administrative commitments delivered in due time.	No inventory of the rules and regulations available yet.	Inventory of rules available 7-2008.	Financial and administrative commitments: check of the project books	Project administrator

Table 2 Project ratings

Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), and Unsatisfactory (U)

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE				RATING
	U	MS	S	HS	
PROJECT FORMULATION					
Conceptualization/Design					
Stakeholder participation					
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION					
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					
PROJECT RESULTS					
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objective					
Achievement of objective					
Outcome 1					
Outcome 2					
Outcome 3					
Outcome 4					
Outcome 5					
OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT					

* *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

** **Ratings:**

HS – highly satisfactory

S – satisfactory

MS – marginally satisfactory

U - unsatisfactory

Abstracts from UNDP/GEF M&E Guidance (not to be included in the report)

4. Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

4.1. Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership/Drivenness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

- (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.
- (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
- (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
- (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
- (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

- (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
- (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
- (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
- (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

- (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
- (iv) Co-financing ⁷

Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoC and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R): Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff