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# Executive Summary

Kazakhstan continues to undergo significant ecological and social change, the rural population has begun to learn that it needs to rely on its own efforts to if it is to survive and prosper, particularly those depending on livestock and natural pastures. Government can help and is directing resources towards assisting such efforts towards self reliance but with the passing of the state farm sector and the almost total disappearance of transhumance practices it is not yet armed with readily transferable new pasture management technologies with which to provide guidance.

Over grazing near village centres over much of the post Soviet era and underutilisation of distant pastures is reportedly causing systemic changes to pasture composition that if not arrested may have lasting impacts on resilience. There is a commonly recognised need to rationalise pasture use in ways that are accepted by the majority of herders and Government that will deliver the ecosystem goods and services the community expects over time.

Government is moving to decentralise pasture management decisions from the national level to the local level, a fundamental difference in aim from the previous practice of centralised control. Its implementation however is at a very early stage because, in the absence of enabling regulation, it effectively over lays the preceding grazing rights and central Government agency duties to supervise such rights.

The strategy of the project is to encourage participation in trying new grazing regimes through on-the-ground pilot activities and then to test and demonstrate an enhanced local level pasture management system that may replicate some of the historically practiced sustainable transhumance practices. The Project’s preparation documents suggest that there is not yet a sustainable grazing model suitable for replication in the present situation in Kazakhstan so that some experimentation is implied to assist in discovering some.

The Project has established some pilot activities and the local community is engaged and interested but they will need to see these and try others in the context of several seasons before acceptance can be expected. We assess that the project is too short for this acceptance to occur sufficiently to confidently recommend institutional and regulatory change that Government at different levels will follow through. We assess this is a fault in design, which under estimated the practical difficulties involved in achieving the Project’s Objective of demonstrating good practice in rangeland management, an objective which has been pursued ever since the demise of the Soviet system almost 20 years ago. We assess that staffing difficulties have impacted on the delivery of some Outputs

The Project has so far achieved many of the planned Outputs intended for this period and these are contributing to the planned Objective;

* A genuinely participatory process in the form of Pasture Committees in the 4 *Selskij Okrugi* has been established and is engaged in working towards the overall Objective along with local government
* Some pilot measures to facilitate distant pasture use have been initiated and can be reinforced and increased to good benefit.
* The project has completed a baseline survey of pasture resources and water resources, which has further defined development needs.
* The project has a achieved a level of awareness both locally and in the wider population for its Objective and has established a good base of communication with the media at different levels with which to publicise and disseminate successful new management practices as these are demonstrated.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

Key Points

* *Project overall is evaluated as* ***Marginally Satisfactory****.*
* *Implementation on the ground has been mixed and the implementation approach is evaluated a* ***Satisfactory****.*
* *Project stakeholder participation has been evaluated as* ***Satisfactory****.* ***.***
* *Project monitoring and evaluation has been evaluated as* ***Satisfactory****.*
* *The sustainability of the Project has been evaluated as* ***Marginally Satisfactory****.*

We recommend that the project begin the process of seeking an extension to enable objectives to be achieved without the interruption of a new project

We recommend the co-managers document their experience of collaboration for the further harmonization and to assist setting up a more formal joint venture operational agreement.

We recommend a review of local staff employment to identify the reasons for slowness in hiring local experts.

We recommend a review of the project procurement plan to identify better systems to ensure supplies can be provided in the right season for efficient and effective operation.

We recommend the project engage more intensively with the Ministry of Agriculture other agencies and other projects operating in the area to identify further opportunities for partnerships.

We recommend consideration be given to facilitating the establishment of local contractors to repair wells and other infrastructure to enhance implementation capacity and improve sustainability.

We recommend consideration of some more experimental activities to be derived from a more analytical assessment of the relevance of international experience to Kazakh conditions, including that of returned Kazakhs from China and Mongolia. This will also reduce the risk that a replicable pasture management model might not be discovered.

We recommend the Project devote more attention to negotiating agreements to maintain and manage assets provided, such as water supply, to improve the sustainability of these important activities, including by consideration of sale or transfer of the assets to private ownership, for example to extended family groups.

# Introduction

This Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) has been commissioned as part of the normal UNDP–GEF adaptive management requirement and was commissioned through a public tender process advertised by UNDP in Astana in June 2010.

## **Project Background**

The project is part of the CACILM CPP approved by the GEF council in August 2006 and arises from the Kazakh National Program Framework (NPF). It seeks to build on results and lessons of several projects including though the WB/GEF Drylands Management Project that demonstrated the environmental, social and economic viability of shifting from the current unsustainable cereal-based production in dryland ecosystems to traditional livestock-based management in a pilot area of the Shetsky district of Karaganda oblast and other community development work sponsored by GTZ and the UNDP, Small Grant Program.

It is part of a similar class of Medium Size Projects (MSP)s in other Central Asian countries including: “Demonstrating Sustainable Mountain Pasture Management in the Suusamyr Valley” (Kyrgyzstan), “Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Land Degradation and Improving Sustainable Land Management in SW Tajikistan” (Tajikistan), “Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investments for Sustainable Land Management” (Turkmenistan), and “Achieving Ecosystem Stability on degraded land in Karakalpakstan and the Kyzylkum Desert“ (Uzbekistan). Each of these projects is addressing somewhat similar objectives and they are anticipating learning from each other. The project was intended to maintain close links with the GEF Small Grants Program.

## **The Purpose of the Evaluation**

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective so far, and to produce possible recommendations on how to improve the management of the project until its completion in March 2012.

Particular emphasis is to be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. Project performance is to be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework

## **Key issues addressed**

The MTE is to assess:

* Project Concept and Design
* Implementation
* Project outputs, Outcomes and Impact
* Projects Adaptive Management Framework
* Underlying Factors
* UNDP Contribution
* GTZ Contribution
* Partnership Strategy

The MTE will also:

* test and confirm the key hypotheses underlying the project
* reassess risks and assumptions
* examine to which degree cross-sectoral issues such as gender mainstreaming have been taken into account
* present initial lessons learnt about project design, implementation and management

## **The outputs of the evaluation and how they will be used**

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, 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.

This MTE is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. It will provide an opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The core product of the MTE is this Mid-Term Evaluation Report. The report documents the strengths and weaknesses in the project’s design, strategy and implementation. It is intended to play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on:

1. How to strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project;
2. How to ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF Objective;
3. How to enhance organizational and development learning, and;
4. How to enable informed decision-making.

## **Methodology of the evaluation**

1. The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has two overarching objectives, namely to promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities; and to promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, programme management, and projects and to improve knowledge and performance. With this in mind, this Mid-term evaluation (MTE) was initiated by UNDP Kazakhstan as the GEF Implementation Agency for the Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural Livelihood and Environmental Integrity to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of Project activities in relation to the stated objectives and to collate lessons learned.
2. The MTE was conducted over a period of 9 days between 13th September and 21st September 2010 by an international consultant and two national consultants. The approach was determined by the terms of reference (Annex I) which were closely followed, via the itinerary detailed in Annex II.
3. The general approach is to triangulate the results of the document review, interviews with different classes of stakeholder and observations in the field; this is to build a reliable picture of the present situation for the purposes of rating achievements. This builds understanding and also provided opportunities to communicate some preliminary findings from some stakeholders to others as an aid to adaptive management. Throughout the evaluation, particular attention was paid to explaining carefully the importance of listening to stakeholders’ views and in reassuring staff and stakeholders that the purpose of the evaluation was not to judge performance in order to apportion credit or blame but to measure the relative success of implementation and to determine learn lessons for the wider GEF context. A list of people interviewed in given in Annex III. The draft report was submitted on 27th October and was finalized on 29th November 2010 after receipt of comments on 15th of November.
4. Full details of the objectives of the MTE can be found in the ToR (Annex I), but the evaluation has concentrated on assessing the concept and design of the Project, its implementation in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs, and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out, and the objectives and outcomes achieved. The MTE consisted of 3 days desktop study of available project documentation, 7 days in country consisting of field trips, interviews, and meetings etc, 5 days validating the results and 5 days finalising the Draft report giving a total 20 person days of international consulting time and 30 days for the National Expert.
5. Particular attention has been given to the likely sustainability of its results. The MTE was able to meet most key stakeholders.
6. Wherever possible the MTE has tried to evaluate issues according to the criteria listed in the *UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, namely:

* Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
* Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
* Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
* Results – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
* Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

1. The MTE has evaluated the Project’s performance against the Logframe according to the current six-point evaluation criteria provided to it by the GEF. This is reproduced in Table 1 for clarity.

**Table 1: Criteria used to evaluate the Project by the Mid-term evaluation Team**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)** | Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)** | Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits**.** |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

## **Structure of the evaluation**

The first section of the MTE briefly reviews the Project context and its program logic

The second section reviews the project’s performance over the first half of its lifetime with particular reference to the projects Logical Framework Matrix and its work plans; this is supported by annexes with detailed notes on each part of these.

The third section, key findings, considers what has been the impact of the project and how has it contributed to the GEF Objectives. The MTE in this section has:

* Assessed the appropriateness of the design using GEF evaluation criteria
* Assessed the effectiveness of the individual activities (monitoring performance);
* Assessed the effectiveness of the various activities in achieving the Outcome (monitoring the impact), and;
* Assessed the effectiveness of the various Outcomes on achieving the Objective (monitoring the change).

This analysis has allowed the MTE to comment on the:

* Implementation – has the project done what it planned to do (i.e. is the plan still untested because the implementation was poor);
* Effectiveness – has the plan met the predicted objectives by this time (i.e. has the plan been tested and found to have flaws), and;
* Validation of the model’s parameters and relationships (i.e. which assumptions, variables and interactions were correct).

Based upon this the MTE has made reasoned statements about the projects progress towards anticipated results and the GEF Objective; in the form of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

# The Project and its Development Context

Evaluation is part of adaptive management. An important part of evaluation is an understanding of the context within which the project is taking place.

In common with most countries in Central and North Asia the experience of the period of the command economy was one of over exploitation of natural resources in the search for increased production. In regard to pasture resources this meant over grazing and a breakup of traditional transhumance grazing patterns and culling systems that had protected the grasslands for millennia. This forcing of the grazing and farming system was often against the inclination of technical specialists aware of local conditions and in response to demands from people remote from the consequences of their actions. Since the demise of the Soviet Union each country in Central Asia has responded in different ways to the departure of central planning with different results but none have succeeded in developing a new model that is considered productive and sustainable and none consider a return to the pre Soviet system to be desirable because of new expected standards of education, health services etc, which of necessity require a significant settled community in fixed towns and with fixed roads and other infrastructure.

In the case of Kazakhstan this pressure for production was exacerbated by a massive program to open up new lands for cereal production, much of which was in lands unsuited for this purpose, or which was pursued with out replacing all the nutrients used in grain production resulting in very significant areas of degraded lands. Accordingly the early work to rehabilitate rangelands was directed towards these formerly cropped areas. The World Bank-GEF supported *Dry-lands Management Project* was one reported success that is important as a precedent for this project. Another was the NGO *CAMP Kazakhstan Public Foundation,* which had achieved success in involving local communities in development planning and this formed part of the planning context.

A significant issue since the break up of the former state farms and large state owned herds into small private herds has been a fall in numbers and production but very uneven grazing with over grazing close to settled areas and un-grazed areas further out. GTZ has been supporting activities to solve these problems since at least 2002 through its *Programme for the sustainable use of natural resources in Central Asia,* a parent program of CACILM of which this project is part.

In the last few years there is reported evidence that livestock numbers have begun to rise again in response to better livestock product markets, this has exacerbated the pressure on accessible pastures.

## **Project start and its duration**

The Project was prepared in successive steps from the PDF A in 2005 to the PDF B in 2007. Although the inception phase was approved to begin in September 2008, the effective start date was delayed until January 2009 because of staffing issues, both the National Project Manager and then the Chief Technical Officer (CTA) left the project and Global Financial Crisis further complicated the start up. The Inception workshop was conducted in April 2009 constituting the effective start date.

The project is planned to last 3 years, with a MTE in 2010, a relatively short time to demonstrating results in such a variable climate with only 3 annual cycles in which to convince a skeptical audience. The justification for such a short period was evidently because it was thought that the models developed under the WB-GEF project and other GTZ and Government experience with small projects working with local Government in degraded grazing areas were immediately replicable.

## **Implementation status**

At the point of this MTE the project is in its second year of implementation, slightly more than one full season remains to achieve its objective.

## **The problems the project seeks to address**

In the post 1990 period most attention to land management has been given to arable lands and not to the peculiarities of rangeland management with their multiple use and multiple users. Significant areas of rangeland situated far away from human settlements were abandoned due to poor access, lack of required infrastructure and water to support the rural population and their livestock. There has been a lack of incentives and security over land use rights for people to address these deficiencies. The exclusion of a large part of rangelands from agricultural or grazing use and their long-term idleness have had a negative impact on their condition with unpalatable weed growth, reduced productivity, and reduced the area of watered pastures. At the same time, the pressure on rangeland situated near human settlements and watering points has lead to a dramatic deterioration of the overall condition of pastures and rangelands near villages and remaining watering places.

The results of problem analysis conducted during preparation identified the main drivers of the degradation of rangelands as policy, regulatory, institutional, socio-economic, financial, and knowledge barriers. The project aims to remove these barriers by creating an enabling environment and capacities at local (rayon) and provincial (oblast) levels to create models to be used in the wider context of CACILM.

The barriers identified in the PDF B from the problem identification activities include:

Social/policy barriers: Insufficient public participation in decision-making. It is often difficult for remote regions to be informed about or to influence decisions made at the centre. People at village level are still not used to taking decisions on their own initiative. Decentralised management of natural resources is in a very early stage and needs to be developed in order to allow people to take greater responsibility.

Regulatory barriers: While Kazakhstan has a well-developed system of laws related to SRM most of these are not able to be enforced and require development of a number of bylaws at different levels. There are gaps, duplication of duties between concerned agencies, contradictions in the legal framework and law enforcement is weak. The Land Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan, adopted in 2003, is a step forward but it was directed at regulating arable lands not grazing lands. As a result the rights to use distant pastures are confused, some residual rights to old state farms remain under local Government control, some have been leased for various periods but the status of these leases is uncertain and the arrangements are not sufficiently reflected in the Land Code, nor are issues regarding zoning at the landscape level or grazing rotations recognised. Kazakh herders are constrained from attempting to re-establish transhumant systems (the only model left) because of various legal restrictions referring to user rights, migration routes, licenses, legal status of herders’ cooperatives, etc.

Socio-economic barriers: Most families own relatively small herds so it is usually not cost-effective to bring these herds to distant pastures (*jailyau*) on an individual basis. Based on experiences in the Soviet era, many villagers are suspicious of any form of collectives. Infrastructure at distant pastures (access roads, housing, water, energy, storage, marketing facilities, veterinary services, etc.) is mostly absent and the government does not see this as an investment priority. According to the Research Institute of Water Economy, only 32 million ha of rangelands, or 17 percent (out of 187 million ha) are supplied with water. In 83 percent of rangeland areas, wells are either deteriorated due to poor or no maintenance, or water is no longer there. In the absence of infrastructure there is also no market for professional people offering livestock-owners to bring their herds to distant pastures during the summer months.

Institutional barriers: The responsibilities for rangeland management are spread over many different institutions, acting at local (*rayon*), provincial (*oblast*) or state level. These all deal only with specific aspects related to their own agency’s mandate and none has an overall responsibility for the rational use of pasture lands. The coordination of government programmes and policies at oblast level by the oblast representative and executive bodies, at rayon level by the rayon bodies, and at district and village (*aul*) levels by *akims* is very weak and does not follow integrated concepts. At the local level, an *akim* (head of a village) has for example no power to take decisions; he has only the right to make suggestions to higher state authorities. Institutional barriers include the fact that combating land degradation ranks low on the political agenda; there are low material and immaterial incentives for staff of the responsible agencies.

Technical/knowledge barriers: There is a lack of models of how to manage livestock to provide a livelihood in an environmentally sound, sustainable manner. In the large Soviet state and collective farms, each employee had specialised tasks which he/she was educated and trained for and they looked to the state to provide sustenance and guidance. The former system based on traditional knowledge proliferated from one generation to the next is little remembered and longer directly applicable.

## **The immediate and development objectives of the project**

The project objective is to demonstrate good practice in rangeland management that promotes both the ecological integrity of natural grasslands and rural livelihoods. There are four key development outcomes, which contribute towards achieving this objective:

* An enabling environment which is conducive for Sustainable Rangeland Management enhanced at the central and local level;
* The capacities and knowledge of integrated SRM on the part of local government, community-based structures and individual farmers is strengthened;
* Improved local infrastructure that allows greater mobility of livestock herds; and
* That adaptive management practices are institutionalised to promote learning.

The project is to have its focus on the local level by working directly with the target groups and communities. It will, however, also need to influence the regional (oblast) and national levels to create the enabling environment necessary to create and demonstrate successful models.

## **Main stakeholders**

The main stakeholders in the project are those that can influence the outcome and will be most impacted by the results. These can be summarised as the local authorities and communities who will have to implement and learn from the activities and those able to provide technical guidance, enabling policy and legal settings and those able to provide the finance. These are summarised in Annex F Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the PDF status report attached to MSP Prodoc.

The main stakeholders involved in the preparation activities were those able to influence the start up process and the overall concepts; those with information on other natural resource projects and those with financial resources; UNDP, WB, ADB and GEF & GTZ.

The main stakeholders invited to participate in workshops to draft the logic framework of the project included representatives of Ministry of Environment Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Agency of Land Resource Management), scientific organisations, local NGOs, and some leaders of several rural communities. International and local experts on sustainable pasture management and land degradation also participated along with some in the private sector. 35% percent of the workshop participants were women.

The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH and its associated CAMP Kazakhstan Public Foundation bought their capacities for rangeland management and in implementing participatory approaches with local communities to the planning table.

Local authorities and rural communities in the selected project area were involved in the project preparation and information collection and contacts have been established with heads of regional Agriculture Department, Statistics Office and Land Unit.

As project implementation proceeds the emphasis is to be placed on local participants and concerned agency staff and related projects to influence outcomes.

## **Results expected**

The expected results listed below are recorded as goals in the Logical Framework Matrix

The expected result (overall objective) is: *Demonstration of good practice in rangeland management that promotes both the ecological integrity of natural grasslands and local livelihood, and serves as a model for replicating SRM throughout the country*

Observations:

A conclusion reached in the Request for CEO Endorsement Report attached to the MSP Prodoc is relevant to this objective

*“Despite a number of efforts towards enhancing livestock and rangeland management, best practice ready for up-scaling is still not available”. (Part 11 Project Justification, page 10)*

This conclusion suggests that work is still required to develop good practices for rangeland management in the circumstances existing in Kazakhstan – a difficult task in three years (see also result 4, learning and adaptive management, below).

The indicators listed in the Logical Framework matrix for this overall objective are reductions in soil erosion by 20%, unwanted plant species reduced or absent over 5% of the area, and an increase in income by 20% - all within 3 years. We concur with the risk noted in Logical Framework matrix, that these changes will be very difficult to measure over such a short time as other events, such as seasonal differences and other economic changes, may mask any impact due to project activities..

Status at mid-term:

The project has made progress in many of the outcomes that are intended to lead to this objective (see below), but not all.

This result is then expressed as Outcomes as below:

Expected Outcome 1:

*An environment which is conducive to Sustainable Rangeland Management enhanced at the central and local level.*

Observations:

The logical framework matrix indicates that there are two sequential steps, i) “the establishment of local Pasture committees working effectively at each Selskii Okrug level”, and then ii) “Proposals for regulations, changes in structures supporting sustainable SRM and the use of distant pastures and grazing rotation (2011)”

The project has achieved the first of these steps (see also below) and has undertaken some study of the regulatory barriers and other studies in preparation for the second step however it has not yet achieved all that was planned to date due to staff shortages.

Status at mid-term: The project has made progress with this outcome but is behind schedule with some outputs.

Expected Outcome 2:

*Capacities and knowledge on integrated SRM of local government, community-based structures and individual farmers strengthened.*

Observations:

The project has produced and circulated some knowledge products, published a significant number of articles and other media. It has built good media links through which it can disseminate successful results. It has obtained in principle agreement with pasture committees that pasture grazing needs to be regulated. The pasture committees have been given some introductions to Sustainable Rangeland Management

Status at mid-term: The project has made considerable progress towards achieving this outcome and is possibly ahead of schedule.

Expected Outcome 3:

*Local infrastructure that allows greater mobility of livestock herds improved*.

Observations:

There have been some impressive achievements towards this outcome although some problems obtaining suitable contractors for small contracts in remote areas has meant some valued infrastructure, such as water facilities have not yet been achieved. The difficulties can be solved and recommendations have been made to assist this.

Status at mid-term:

The project has achieved a lot towards this outcome and can recover from the difficulties experienced with procurement.

Expected Outcome 4

*Learning, evaluation and adaptive management implemented*

Observations:

The planned activities of monitoring and evaluating project outputs have been achieved as planned. Management reports and work plans are produced and acted on as planned.

However achieving the overall result requires adaptive management at a higher level than just learning specific techniques. It also expected that sufficient relevant stakeholders will have appreciated the benefits of the results (outcomes) above to be able to confidently support needed changes in the enabling environment and accept the models demonstrated for replication elsewhere. Pasture management committees are learning in informal ways but are not yet involved in formal monitoring as anticipated.

As anticipated in the Request for CEO Endorsement Report this deeper adaptive management learning is not simple and will require several iterations for success.

*“The project will be governed by a continuous process of learning; it will be necessary to adapt the ultimate scale and quality of SRM continuously according to the experiences and achievements of the project. The principle of “double-loop learning” will be applied, where not only the process, but also the expected outcomes are reviewed on a continuous basis”. (Part 11 Project Justification, page 14)*

Status at mid-term:

The project has set up and is conducting its management, planning and reporting as planned. Notwithstanding some difficulties with staffing the project is being managed successfully. However monitoring and adaptive management by pasture committees and livestock producers is not yet occurring in a formal way.

The analysis in the following section assesses achievements against the component activities that are intended to achieve the expected results discussed above.

# An analysis of Outcomes, the Outputs and the Partnership Strategy at present

The analysis below is supported by Annex 6 where the National Consultant has tabulated achievements at the time of the MTE against the Logframe as expressed in the 2009 - 2010 work plan. The conclusions reached are the results of MTE activities. All comments have at least two sources of evidence, documents plus observation or interviews in any combination. Where findings are stronger or weaker this is noted. The component numbers relate to the numbers in the expected results section above, i.e. components 1.1 and 1.2 support expected result (outcome) 1 above etc.

Component 1.1 *Review of regulatory instruments... elaboration of proposed amendments*

Although this component is not yet due to have been completed some progress has been made. The first year was used to study legal problems concerning rangeland management by the project. This and experience with grazing in the second year is to be discussed at a National Round Table at the end of 2010.

Observations:

The project design implies that the proposals are to be generated only after successful grazing practices are demonstrated upon which proposed regulations can be based.

3 years is a short time for this to occur as the pasture committees were to be established and formulate plans in year one, activities implemented in year 2 were to be evaluated in year 2 and proposals generated and submitted in year 2. Since the project ends in March 2012 (the end of the winter) there will be little new to be evaluated in the 3rd year.

Proposals can be submitted as planned.

Component 1.2 *Identification and promotion of economic and other incentives for SRM*

3 out of 5 planned activities have been either completed or substantial activities initiated. The basic socio economic surveys under 3.1 have completed in each year have provided useful back ground and scenarios for the SRM drafted. Difficulties employing staff have inhibited completion of the balance of planned work.

Observations:

The work can still be completed and used to contribute to the intended outcome.

Component 1.3 *Study of marketing and processing of livestock products*

The socio economic surveys discussed under 3.1 have provided some background to this component but most of the planned work has not been completed due to difficulties recruiting a specialist.

Observations:

The work can still be completed and used to contribute to the intended outcome.

Component 1.4 *Establishment of pasture committees in each local Government area*

This has been achieved and is a notable success as it indicates community interest in the project. The MTE team was able to observe vigorous exchanges that indicated engagement in project planning and in the evaluation of results.

Observations:

It will be important that further results are achieved and appreciated to maintain this engagement. The MTE team heard from these meetings and other interviews that project delays in the planning and inception phase were keenly felt by local people. This observation was reinforced from several directions and indicates that the present Project momentum needs to be maintained if the ground gained in commitment and engagement towards the desired overall result is not to be lost.

Component 2.1 *A better understanding of pasture degradation*

The activities planned to date have been implemented; there have been small scale awareness building activities in each *Selskii Okrug* and the benefits in terms of awareness observed in the three sites visited by the MTE team. There have been several relevant publications in the national press.

Component 2.2 *Strengthen human capacities at the local level.*

The activities planned to date have been implemented. Much is expected from the planned inputs of Camp- Alatoo to discuss pasture management planning.

Component 2.3 *Establish a system of knowledge management for dissemination*

The activities planned to date have been implemented. There have been a significant number of publications and the project is well prepared to publicise success and lessons in various media (see Annex 5 and Annex 6).

Component 2.4 *Greater awareness and capacities of the role of SRM for rural growth*

The activities planned to date have been implemented, there have been several study tours, and some staff attended an international meeting in Uzbekistan arranged by CACILM.

A particularly important visit was arranged for the National Project Director (NPD) to see project achievements and this resulted in significantly more, and more relevant, support for project activities. This was stated by several project staff and corroborated without prompting by the NPD in the final briefing.

Comment: The support of this NPD stakeholder is a key to achieving the over all expected result and coordinating different agencies and disseminating results more widely in the country. However it is to be noted, that, like the local livestock herders, he is much more impressed by physical outputs leading in the desired direction that he is by output in terms of printed material and course work. It is important to continue these inputs.

Component 3.1 *Survey of natural and social economic conditions in the 4 local government areas*

The activities planned to date have been implemented and these constitute a base line against which changes during the project period may be measured.

Observations:

Comments on these surveys suggest that detecting changes due to project activities may be masked by changes in the external economic environment (such as the recent Government pay rise which has benefited particularly female employees in rural towns and villages). This was assessed as a risk at inception and remains so.

Component 3.2 *Land use plans that are negotiated and agreed with stakeholders at local level*

Some planned activities, TOR and some plan ideas have been documented but this component is behind schedule due to difficulties finding appropriate staff to work with the Pasture Committees on this subject. The MTE team met some herders who were clearly willing to discuss new pasture management ideas and who have developed their own plans but would need time to absorb the lessons that may stem from these.

Observation:

Clear evidence such as improved weight gain, calving percentages or other observable beneficial change is needed to convince key stakeholders of the benefits of suggested grazing system changes.

It will take some time for new land use patterns to be shown as useful and discussion with herders and staff indicates a possible need to reallocate some pasture areas between *Selskij Okrugi* to facilitate more rational pasture use.

Component 3.3 *Investment plans which reflect the requirements for decreasing land degradation and mobilization of distant pastures*

Many plans have been formulated with participants and have been implemented, it is unfortunate that many water rehabilitation activities planned have been delayed because the contracts are either too small or too distant to attract the larger companies or because the smaller companies are not considered reliable enough to be awarded contracts (see recommendations). It is noted that the GEF small grants scheme was used successfully to rehabilitate 7 wells in the region. The component can be considered on time except for water rehabilitation, but this is the most highly valued investment.

Observations:

There is evidently an issue with regard to contracting simple infrastructure investments in remote areas that the project needs to address to improve efficiency and effectiveness with this important. This is also important for sustainability as, if there is no capacity to maintain assets, they will likely deteriorate. The MTE team was not able to determine who is to be responsible for maintaining assets apart from the committee and this form of control was agreed as unlikely to be sustainable in distant locations. Recommendations to solve this possible problem appear below

Component 3.4 *Contributions to on-ground investments in local infrastructure needs for mobility for livestock and a more balanced use*

Much has been achieved in this popular component and it is on time.

Observations:

The MTE is doubtful about the sustainability of these assets as no agreements for maintenance were sighted and discussions on this point were vague with both, staff and livestock owners, recommendations to solve this possible problem have been provided below.

Component 4.1 *Monitoring and evaluation*

Monitoring by the Steering Committee and its member institutions separately, has occurred and the appropriate reports including PIR and quarterly reports were observed. Documentary evidence was seen that the managers and staff have addressed the implementation difficulties due to staffing issues procurement and time delays and that follow up actions had occurred, Adaptive management in this practical implementation sense has been occurring (see also below under adaptive management).

Observations:

However participatory monitoring of project outcomes as articulated in the project document has not yet begun, except informally by pasture committees, there is time for some in the next year but in this sense formal adaptive management has not yet begun.

Component 4.2 *Dissemination of project results*

The planned activities have been undertaken and dissemination channels through media, other projects and CACILM have been established. The project is well prepared to disseminate successful results and lessons

Component 4.3 *Adapted work plans that reflect the projects adaptive management objective with regard to design*

This project management activity apparently works well and the two agencies implement the project according to a joint work and financial plan.

This component lists activities to produce knowledge products to assist adaptive management and the project has undertaken significant work in the form of basic studies of each region and technical studies of subjects important to the overall objective of Demonstration of good practice in rangeland managemen. Two significant examples are “Sustainable Rangeland Management; A Comparison of Four Rangeland Management Systems” and “Monitoring of seeding of forage grass at Matybulak”.

Observations;

These are important activities in view of the preparation team conclusion that a “best practice ready for up-scaling is still not available” The MTE team review of these documents suggests some improvements to further this objective and has discussed these with staff, some Kazakh herders who have relocated from other regions in North and Central Asia, and the CTA.

The results of this review are detailed below under findings with recommendations below that.

# Key Findings

## **Project Formulation**

Project formulation followed a conventional path of the development of project plans by technical specialists experienced in the region informed by workshops of relevant stakeholders to define objectives as discussed above under main stakeholders.

This produced a situation analysis of an unbalanced utilization of available pasture resources due to insufficient knowledge of appropriate livestock management practices and a poor incentive mix of regulatory and other institutional barriers.

The resulting Project concept is to develop a more sustainable approach to managing Kazakhstan’s pasture resources using 4 villages in the Almaty Region as pilot areas. It builds on some previous small scale projects and at least one large project addressing a related area, the rehabilitation of degraded wheat growing lands. It intends to disseminate its results to other regions and nations. While this region has its own distinctive characteristics including closeness to a large city that make it a special case, the objective and concept is assessed as sound and consistent with Government policy. The approach and methodology is transferable; the selected areas have a range of winter and summer pastures, hilly areas, semi desert, desert degraded wheat lands and irrigated areas. The design appropriately features a lot of adaptive learning and management. It proceeds from assessments of the biophysical and socio economic situation to the establishment of pilot activities selected by a participatory process and, upon demonstration of these in action, it develops the intended new more sustainable pasture management systems and arranges for their dissemination.

We find the project as formulated to be relevant, potentially *effective* and *efficient*, and to the extent that the project is successful in demonstrating good practice, it will likely be *sustainable*.

Our reservation regarding *effectiveness* and *efficiency* is that the period for implementation is too short and this conclusion is comes from interviews with all classes of stakeholder, except one of the co managers.

The significant contributing factors are:

* The design apparently anticipated implementing pilot activities developed elsewhere, in practice a period of initial study was still necessary before pilot physical activity development could begin and there was no rangeland management model ready to follow.
* In much of this climatic zone rain and snow fall is erratic between seasons and plants are slower to mature, for example *Agrophyron*, a important species for rehabilitating degraded wheat lands, takes some 2-3 years to become established sufficiently for a settled grazing pattern to be established, (as discussed in project reports on grass seeding at Matybulak)
* Most importantly, the most significant development anticipated is that which occurs in the minds of the stakeholders as they see the target activities in successful action and begin to focus on different pasture management possibilities. Evidence of the importance of this time effect in building awareness and capacity on the part of stakeholders was observed by the MTE team in all types of relevant stakeholder, from the highest Ministry of Agriculture officials, who only began to support the project once they had seen on-ground actions that looked effective, through local Government and livestock herders. This was also stated in the 2010 PIR (IP Rating)“ *Taking as an example the organization of the training on participatory management of natural resources, including pasture resources and improvement of pasture infrastructures, which was planned to implement in 2009, but was not completed because villagers do not wanted even to listen about the trainings, as they wanted to see real field work, for this reason project postponed carrying of the training to 2010;”*
* The project rightly focuses on the development of new pasture use regulations and even law; there may be a need to reallocate some pasture areas between Selskij Okrugi. These are formidable tasks, and not the least being the required collaboration between the local authorities the Ministry of Agriculture, the State Land Agency and the Ministry of Environment, all of whom have an interest in land and pasture management issues. It is likely sufficient of these will need to become convinced by results before they will risk promoting change. Considerable political will is required for success.
* The NPD has indicated that the Project must demonstrate scientifically and economically that the pilot activities work before it can expect to disseminate these widely and use them as a basis for new regulations

### Implementation approach

The basic implementation approach is to work closely with relevant stakeholders at each level to demonstrate good practice, to evolve new management and regulatory mechanisms and to implement and replicate successful results. Success will depend on the continuing involvement of relevant stakeholders and being able to demonstrate effective new practices to these stakeholders

We find this approach to be *relevant, effective, efficient* and *sustainable*, and a necessary condition for success

### Country ownership

We, and almost all stakeholders interviewed, assess the project as being highly relevant in the national and international context and to its international partners such as GEF. The problems it addresses are urgent and directly relevant to land degradation nationally and across borders. It has particular relevance to the institutional aspects of establishing new pasture use practices.

Government had demonstrated ownership by agreeing to support it from a high level and assigning a high official as National Project Director (NPD). The project is specifically mentioned in the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification and in the CACILM National Programming Framework. Government made significant commitments for co financing and relevant in kind support as can be seen in attachments to the Prodoc submitted to GEF.

We find country ownership to be adequate for *effectiveness* and *efficiency* although continued ownership is subject to key officials observing good *results* in terms of models for pasture management that can be replicated and supported.

### Stakeholder participation

The project has broadly speaking followed the stakeholder engagement strategy set out in attachments to the Prodoc although with some exceptions

The MTE team was able to observe good and vigorous engagement by members of the pasture committees met in two districts and other meetings and interviews held by the team indicates that there is still strong interest within local herders, village authorities.

Interviews suggest that participation by stakeholders at the oblast and central level has been much less apparent and this may be inhibiting progress, although this may diminish as more successful practices are demonstrated. These issues are discussed further below under partnership arrangements and underlying factors.

The extended interview with the NDP indicates that he had been somewhat skeptical about the project until he could see evidence of concrete achievements in a recent project visit. To a direct question on this subject of engagement by other official stakeholders, notably within the Ministry of Agriculture and its associated projects, he responded that “more results will see more participation as confidence grows”.

We find that stakeholder participation is adequate but will need to be monitored closely by the steering committee for continued *effectiveness*

### Replication approach

The basic replication approach is to demonstrate good practices, to use this good experience to help promote needed institutional reform and then to publicise the results as a model for replication nationally and internationally through CACILM.

We find this approach to be *relevant, effective and efficient*, ultimate success and sustainability will depend on *results*. For reasons discussed elsewhere, we consider the period too short to produce the results necessary for the approach to be followed through.

### Cost effectiveness

The project takes advantage of the fact that it is part of a loose partnership of similar projects addressing the same complex objective of discovering and replicating new rangeland management practices since the collapse of the previous command economy model some 20 years ago. Both GTZ and UNDP are also involved in many of these other projects, and GTZ has supported other directly relevant community based approaches to finding solutions. This sharing of experience is *cost effective* and is to be encouraged.

Cost effectiveness is also relevant to the implementation of needed inputs, in this regard some issues have emerged due to the remoteness of many of the project sites where infrastructure is required and the small scale of each investment. It is a necessary part of the project logic that infrastructure be provided in distant pasture locations and that these be investments on a small scale suitable for the small extended family groups that may utilise these.

However interviews, inspections and project reports all suggest that significant needed infrastructure investments have been delayed, notably water. This has caused delay in some planned outputs as discussed above and has the potential to add to the need additional time for the project, impacting on cost *effectiveness*. Some have suggested this is due to procurement difficulties inherent in the internationally accepted procedures followed by UNDP but interviews and observations in the field indicate the situation is more complex.

The best example of the difficulty probably lies with the needed rehabilitation or replacement of the water wells or bores and pumping equipment that are essential to utilise distant pastures. While there are Kazakh companies able to undertake this work they are geared up for larger tasks in the mineral industry etc and are unwilling to offer small scale services in distant locations for prices that would be reasonable. The GEF Small Grants Scheme has evidently been able to assist in the rehabilitation of 7 small wells in the project area by proving funds for local people to undertake the repairs but these are for situations requiring only small hand tools. The MTE Team inspection of some destroyed water bores and pumps and discussion with for local village people indicates that some specialised equipment and pipe tools are also required to pull casing from old bores and to clean holes and replace with appropriate casing and acquiring this capability would require some investment by contractors. The Project has undertaken a detailed assessment in its “pasture water resources report” (2010) and our review of the identified work further confirms this finding that necessary works are mostly not very complex although contractors will need to make some investment to be capable of such work.

In our opinion, supported by some interviews, the skills and capital required to support Rayon level contractors to successfully undertake the repairs of this medium scale are likely to be available if some continuity of work was assured. This would require some local technical assistance and specially written agreements so that the GEF small grants type funding might be provided for this purpose.

We find that the project needs to address some issues related to procurement and recruitment to improve cost *effectiveness*.

**UNDP Comparative advantage**

UNDP has some advantages in implanting a project of this nature requiring institutional reform in that it can approach relatively high officials in a formal way to address concerns where the Steering Committee is unable to achieve the desired attention.

We find that the UNDP involvement does provide some advantages and that they have been *effective*

**GTZ Comparative advantage**

GTZ Regional program has worked for several years in Central Asia and Kazakhstan and provided valuable experience in participatory work with stakeholders and a bottom-up approach of project implementation. Financial flexibility and the substantial increase of funding improve possibilities of implementation.

We find that the GTZ involvement provides advantages and that they have been effective.

**Linkages between the Project and other interventions in the**

**Sector**

At the present time the project operates fairly autonomously from other Government interventions in the sector. Although it has benefited from prior experience and retains links with NGO collaborators such as Camp- Alatoo who have skills in community development interviews, observation, interviews and perusal of files and reports do not indicate collaboration with others being initiated by the Ministry of Agriculture. As discussed elsewhere this may be because there are not yet clear examples of new rangeland management practices to show. The project does maintain some links with other internationally funded projects in the sector

We find that linkages between the Project and other Government interventions in the sector to be not yet satisfactory for effectiveness however there is time to improve this as *results* can be demonstrated.

**Management arrangements**

The co management system intended for this project is a somewhat new development for development assistance and as may be expected there are some difficulties. There are cultural differences between the concerned agencies (as there are between all agencies) and it may be that only extraordinary staff, or situations where most staff identify with one agency or the other that these difficulties can be overcome. In the case of this project responsibilities and management arrangements between National Project Manager and Chief Technical Advisor had to be clarified after one year of implementation. Both parties also agreed that the CTA represents the GTZ Regional Program and dedicates about 20% of his working time to these duties. The staff on the project is of a high standard and is committed to a common idea of the projects objectives.

We find that the management arrangements between the agencies are *effective* and *efficient* although these need to be kept under review by the Steering Committee.

## **Implementation**

### Financial planning

The Project has a Finance Plan and cash flow budget and the cash contributions indicated below have apparently been contributed as planned although there is some slight difficulty as the row implementing agencies have a different approach to procurement and hiring resulting in delayed disbursement and this causes tensions.

Total budget: US$ 3,763,000

Allocated resources (**cash**):

* GEF US$ 950,000
* GTZ US$ 400,000
* UNDP US$ 21,000
* **In kind contributions**:
* UNDP US$ 29,000
* Government US$ 1,900,200
* NGOs US$ 462,800

This table from the Prodoc summarises the plan. However the in-kind contribution from Government is apparently behind schedule and some planned facilities have not been provided. The PIR to April 2010 reports that only $131,083 out of a planned $ 1,900,200 of in-kind inputs had been contributed by the end of that period.

GTZ, funded by BMZ, has already fulfilled its obligations and is about to double its financial contribution to an amount of US$ 800,000.

*We find* that the in kind contributions part of the financing plan to be unsatisfactory for *effectiveness* and *efficiency*. The issue was raised with the NPD who recommended the Project write to the Director of Agriculture, Finance, specifying the contributions due under the project.

### Monitoring and evaluation

The project has an operating monitoring and evaluation system and it is used to report Project Inputs and Outputs for reporting purposes. It is intended that this also operate in a participatory way with local stakeholders contributing in recording outcomes. There is some evidence this has begun but this will have to be strengthened as results in the field become apparent and replicable.

The M&E system takes account of the Log Frame Matrix for reporting purposes and this has been updated at inception in response to experience in the inception phase thus passing one test indicating its use in adaptive management.

These changes were made at both the output and indicator level. The changes at output level were mainly to clarify language and combine some overlapping outputs to simplify the Log Frame; they did not change the original intent.

The changes at the indicator level were intended to provide for more verifiable indicators at the output level to aid evaluation by donor investors and Government. As the inception report notes concerning the overall objective level, even with the suggested changes the indicators may not be measurable within the short 3 year period.

As stated above under Implementation Status, the MTE concurs with this reservation as vegetation condition and composition changes may not be observable, or may be masked by seasonal variations and the same reservation applies to income changes.

At the individual output level the changes indicators were mainly to make them more precise and to enhance the ability to measure or observe them to evaluate outputs.

We find the M&E system to be adequate for *effectiveness* and *efficiency* at this stage of the Project but there is room for improvement with respect to participatory monitoring of outcomes. Day to day monitoring including (3) field visits by UNDP CO regular reporting has occurred as intended. GTZ senior staff have also visited.

### Execution and implementation modality

The Project is a joint endeavour between GEF, GTZ, UNDP and the Government of Kazakhstan. UNDP is GEF Implementing Agency through the Country Office in Kazakhstan. UNDP is to implement the project in close cooperation with GTZ Regional CCD Project for Central Asia. Project execution is being undertaken following UNDP national execution or NEX procedures. The Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) is the National Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and is intended provide overall coordination to ensure wide participation through the Project Board and other means (workshops, consultations). The Ministry has appointed a National Project Director to act as liaison person between the Ministry and the project.

This is an unusually complex arrangement and is the reason for some operational and coordination issues discussed below.

We find the modality to be marginally adequate for the task and that significant effort is required to make it more *effective*.

### Management by the UNDP country office

UNDP apparently serves the project quite well, except in the area of procedures required for procurement and hiring, where there is room for more flexibility and the use of different procurement rules for remote areas where the technologies being implemented are fairly simple and able to be implemented by local people, perhaps with some additional support. It might be supposed that its location in Astana might be a problem for a project being implemented near Almaty but interviews did not reveal a difficulty in this regards.

We find UNDP Management to have been adequate for *effectiveness*

### Coordination and operation issues

Coordination on a project with effectively two implementing agencies, in this case UNDP and GTZ, is bound to be difficult. This is because each agency has its own culture and regulations upon which they depend for cohesion, particularly for matters such as procurement and staffing, the two areas that caused a few difficulties according to interviews with staff from both agencies. For example the two implementing agencies reportedly have different approaches to staff conditions which can cause tensions if not harmonized. In the private sector when two large agencies find it necessary to work together in their interests special arrangements are normally entered into under conventions known as Un-incorporated Joint Ventures.

We find that the present arrangements are satisfactory for *effectiveness* or *efficiency* but the arrangements should be kept under review by the steering committee.

### Identification and Management of Risks (Adaptive Management)

The are three aspects to discuss here, i) the identification of risk, ii) actions taken or needed to address risk factors to reduce their impact on the Project (Adaptive Management) and iii) the wider use of adaptive management in ‘double loop’ learning.

i) Some risks are identified in the Logical framework matrix and at least two are impacting on the projects *effectiveness* and *efficiency*.

The Logframe identified that full impact of the project may only appear only after the completion of the inputs in the plan period so that some outcomes, notably the demonstration of new sustainable grazing systems sufficiently to propose new regulations and land use planning guidelines may not appear soon enough to provide the necessary confidence for change and replication.

ii) For reasons discussed above, this risk has eventuated and the Project has not been able to address it. The only solution we can see is to extend the project to provide more time. The solution of developing a new project to provide more time would, in our opinion introduce the very serious risk that momentum would be lost in the field once more, losing the engagement and experience that has been gained to date. This would not be cost *effective*.

iii) Adaptive management is occurring at the management level but is also significant in achieving acceptance of new grazing practices sufficiently for replication as a model. As discussed in the Prodoc this involves double ‘loop learning’ learning where a change in understanding is achieved through successive iterations.

The project has an adaptive management framework for learning but it has yet to complete a full circle in the context of its main objectives. That is, pilot activities have either just come on line (some water facilities and assistance for herders to relocate to distant pasture), or have not yet occurred, and as a consequence it is not yet possible for a substantially new grazing pattern to have been established and the benefits monitored in a participatory way. This means no lessons can yet be seen to have informed later planning or to have been disseminated except in general terms in media articles.

There is another 18 months of the project to run or slightly more than one season, so it is still possible some patterns will appear by the time of the final evaluation but it is unlikely they will have been proven sufficiently to confidently disseminate to others or achieve regulatory changes.

The Prodoc identified that a suitable pasture management model for replication did not exist at the time the preparation report was written. The project has according developed some knowledge products intended to promote discussion around this important subject. Notably one comparing rangeland practices in 4 different countries and one reviewing grassland establishment from an ecological perspective (as detailed above). The MTE Team has reviewed these and discussed aspects of them with staff, some Kazakh herders who have returned to Kazakhstan from other countries and the CTA, as a result we have seen some areas to improve these initiatives.

There were three areas of possible improvement discussed;

* To interpret the interesting observations and ideas for the Kazakh situation; the key technical issues identified in the Prodoc preparation relate to logistics, how to move and control stock economically to utilise different pasture resources at different times. In the report comparing rangeland practices in other lands we expected to, see more discussion about how other rangeland systems have addressed this basic issue. One solution favoured in many modern rangeland situations has been to segment the industry into breeding in distant pasture areas, grow out animals in the mixed farming areas and to fatten stock in favoured areas closer to markets (the NPD also commented that the MoA was actively considering this possibility as a way to improve export performance from Kazakhstan to meet growing markets in Russia). We also expected to see more discussion about systems to control stock by fencing water or feed reserves and different fencing systems,
* To add some discussion about how the Kazakhs from other countries have adapted to the changes since 1989, as they did not all lose all of the traditional practices and some have apparently resurrected some, notably the use of extended family groups as a basic unit of organisation to enable more cost effective use of herding labour and other resources (there are, likely to be others)
* To translate the relevant discussion and workshop some ides about how these other approaches might be applicable to the present Kazakh situation with appropriate stakeholders and to conduct some more trials of possible innovations based on the ideas that emerge from the workshops, including utilising the experience of Kazakhs from Mongolia and China.

We find there is a need to consider further experiments to improve learning and have made some recommendations for this below.

We find there is a risk that assets provided for distant pastures will suffer the same fate as the preceding infrastructure because the agreements concerning control, maintenance and financial contributions for sustained used are vague or non existent. This is reasonable for initial experimental purposes but the Project has a valuable opportunity to assist herders and herder extended families to negotiate *sustainable* arrangements to their benefit.

Evidence of compliance with all of the required risk reporting to UNDP, GEF and GTZ has been sighted in Project files or provided for review (see Annex 4)

We find that risk management and adaptive management procedures to be *effective* but there are serious issues to be addressed as a result of this MTE, particularly related to project duration.

# Additional subjects from the TOR

The Terms of Reference specified some specific subjects to be discussed and evaluated and this section summarises these for ease of reference. Some of these matters have been mentioned above but are discussed in more detail below to lead more specifically to the conclusions and recommendations, with the specific reference from the TOR in *italics*.

### Underlying Factors

*Assess the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results.*

We find that that possibly the major external factor impacting on the project is the much faster pace of economic development in the non agricultural sector. This impacts on availability of good staff and may have positive impacts due to improved market prospects. The project has not yet fully adapted to either of these factors although it has plans to develop a better understanding of the emerging market situation. It is of note that, some herders interviewed expressed spontaneous interest in improved market logistics but lack of staff has inhibited the project following up on this.

We find there is a need to review staffing conditions to see if these are inhibiting the ability to recruit.

We find that the assumption that co-management would work effectively remains to be tested fully; there is a need to make further adjustments to maximize efficiency and effectiveness of implementation and to keep these under review.

### UNDP Contribution under the requirements in its M&E handbook

We have reviewed the project reporting system and found reports to GEF, UNDP etc are up to date and reflect project activities. The PIR treats risk sensibly although it is silent on the widespread view that the project duration is too short and this may be the most significant risk

In a wider sense of UNDP’s ‘soft assistance’ and its policy advocacy role, as we have discussed above, UNDP’s ability to address institutional reform issues at a high level and through its annual policy dialogues is potentially a significant asset in a project that seeks to formulate and recommend reform of such importance. We did not see an example of this but it may be of use later in the project as more results are achieved. We consider UNDP could contribute to improving partnerships with MoA and others with ‘soft assistance’.

We find that UNDP has contributed to the project as intended although both agencies need to work on ways they can both improve *efficiency* and *effectiveness*, as discussed elsewhere.

### Partnership Strategy

*Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:*

The project has plans to involve other stakeholders in M&E and adaptive management but this is not occurring well at present. Pasture committees have been established and had taken part in identifying needs, it remains to complete the adaptive management cycle in coming seasons. CAMP-Alatoo “Learning for sustainability” may be a further step in this.

The project does use local statistics, and seeks to verify these in its own surveys (for example the social survey).

There needs to be at least one iteration of pilot activities before meaningful analysis towards future strategies can be undertaken, the MTE assesses it is a bit early to be able to do this.

The Government operates a micro credit scheme in the project area and other rural development activities, there appears to be a need and opportunity to seek a closer partnership between the project and the Ministry of Agriculture to speed dissemination and to access additional financial resources for herders. Suggested partners include the Small Entrepreneurship Development Fund, State Rural Areas Development Programme, “Clean Water” State Programme.

The Prodoc describes the institutional barrier to improved governance due to overlapping and preexisting duties to record and monitor use rights, promote production, monitor and protect pasture condition between different agencies. While there is evidence of project efforts to resolve these, (for example by paying for the State Land Agency to provide a map of pasture use rights for discussion by Akims through Pasture Committees) the task is complex and requires patience and some times high level assistance.

We find there are opportunities to improve partnerships to improve *effectiveness*

### Specific subjects of interest

*Although the Project covers only four Selskij Okrugi it involves various stakeholders with differing, sometimes opposing interests. The evaluation team will assess the involvement of the stakeholder partnerships – to highlight any successful examples and to identify any risks or gaps in their involvement.*

There appears to be several areas where apposing interests may impact on the project meetings its objectives to develop more sustainable pasture management practices and its enabling regulatory framework:

* Some ambiguity about who is responsible for controlling pasture use, The Ministry of Agriculture and Local Government, or
* The State Land Registry and Local Government,
* The Ministry of Environment also has an interest in protecting natural resources
* The distribution of pasture between local government areas derive from the Soviet period and may no longer be appropriate. This raises the possibility of competition between Local Governments, or at least a need to assist in negotiating swap arrangements on a rational basis

The project is aware of these issues and would like to address them, however it is some what constrained in doing so until it has substantial outcomes on the ground that can be used to illustrate suggested changes.

It has begun an active campaign in the press through a variety of media and this will be ready to communicate successes to higher levels of government to assist in obtaining the political will required to over come these difficulties.

*Ownership of the Project by the Ministry of Agriculture is one of the key factors in the Project’s chances of success. Accordingly the MTE will make an objective assessment of the ownership of the project outcomes/results by the Ministry of Agriculture, provide recommendations to maximize their ownership by the end of the project in March 2012.*

From interviews with representatives of many classes of stakeholder it is apparent the Ministry of Agriculture’s support for, and commitment to, the project began at a low level. However it has improved since the National Project Manager has seen some outputs on site but the commitment does not seem to extend to other Ministry staff.

It is clear that this relationship has room to grow much more and this will require greater input, commensurate with that promised in the project document. This will also require continued effort by project staff to communicate project results to the Ministry and its staff.

We find that this relationship is not yet satisfactory and increased effort is required from both the MoA and the Project to improve collaboration for *effectiveness* and *sustainability*

# Results

**Attainment of objective**

We find that, not withstanding the successes under the project, the main objective will require more time to be achieved that is allowed at present although it is possible that substantial progress will be made. We find that this was an error in design exacerbated by staffing issues

We find the significant successes lie in the establishment and operation of pasture committees involving local government, the implementation of some investments planned collaboratively with stakeholders and the beginning of utilization of distant pastures as a result of project activities.

We find the project is well prepared to disseminate successes within Kazakhstan through links established during the project and to other Central Asian Nations through CACILM.

**Prospects for sustainability**

We find that there are prospects for improvements in sustainability of project initiatives in some important areas:

* There does not at present appear to be a capacity to rehabilitate and keep assets such as water facilities maintained in distant areas, this is a serious risk to sustainability of these assets
* There does not appear to be good agreement between users of assets provided under the project on; who will manage them, be responsible for maintaining them, how this will be paid for and who will be allowed access. There are often complex traditional rights to water use in some areas of Central Asia between those with pasture use rights and those traveling through and disputes over these rights are an important reason for sabotage. Consideration of these rights may increase and this is a serious risk to sustainability.
* The noted weakness in relations between the Project and the MoA and other concerned agencies is a further risk to sustainability of developed pasture management techniques in an institutional sense.

# Conclusions and recommendations

## **Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project**

We recommend that the project begin the process of seeking an extension to enable objectives to be achieved without the interruption of a new project

We recommend the co managers document their experience of collaboration for the further harmonization and to assist the setting up of a more formal joint venture operational agreement.

We recommend a review of local staff employment to identify the reasons for slowness in hiring local experts.

We recommend a review of the procurement plan and timing to ensure supplies can be provided in the right season for efficient and effective operation.

### Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project

We recommend the project engage with the Ministry of Agriculture and other projects operating in the area more intensively to identify further opportunities for partnerships, a program of targeted study tours within and outside Kazakhstan to view good practices elsewhere may be considered.

### Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

We recommend consideration of some more experimental activities to be derived from a more analytical assessment of the relevance of international experience to Kazakh conditions, including that of returned Kazakhs from China and Mongolia as they have retained more of the Pre-Soviet practices (these exist in the Project area). This will also reduce the risk that a replicable pasture management model might not be discovered. The existence of Kazakh returnees in the project area provides an opportunity for a case study approach to analysing the lessons to be learned from their different experience.

.

Examples to be considered might include:

* Different methods of stock control using water, mineral supplements, livestock logistics systems,
* Market segmentation to identify the potential for specialized livestock herders for,
  + breeding, in desert areas,
  + growing out in improved pasture areas and
  + fattening in favoured areas near markets.
* To experiment with adapting truck bodies that will greatly reduce transport costs (possibly 25% of present costs with existing trucks chassis and engines),
* Different fencing systems, for example fencing water points, village areas and good pasture to control access.
* Different fencing technologies, electric, conventional and portable

### Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

We recommend the Project devote more attention to negotiating agreements to maintain and manage assets provided, such as water supply, to improve the sustainability of these important activities*.*

We recommend the Project investigate facilitating the establishment of small enterprises at Rayon level to rehabilitate and maintain water points and other infrastructure by means of providing medium term contracts. This work will likely require additional local technical assistance in civil engineering.

# Lessons learned

**Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance**

The establishment of pasture committees, “Zhayylym Committee” made up of the most active residents, representatives of local government has proven to be a valuable tool to engage the community in the task of developing new pasture use systems and in implementing planned activities. It has enabled the community to take an active role in targeting project resources in the most useful directions to address issues important to pasture users and Government.

# Annex A Terms of Reference

**The consultant on carrying out the mid-term evaluation of the UNDP/GEF/GTZ Project**

**“Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural livelihood and Environmental Integrity”**

**Location:** Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN

**Application Deadline:** 19-Jun-2010

**Additional Category:** Environment and Energy

**Type of Contract:** SSA

**Post Level:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English/Russian

**Starting Date :**   
(date when the selected candidate is expected to start) 10 September 2010

**Duration of Initial Contract:**  Team Leader (international expert) – 20 working days

**Background**

**Standard UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation requirements**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the joint UNDP-GTZ project will follow the UNDP/GEF policy on project evaluation. The Mid-term evaluation 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 mix of tools is 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 exercise such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”(see <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>) and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy: (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>).

Evaluations in the GEF explore five major criteria:

1. Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
2. Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
3. Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
4. Results – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
5. Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue delivering benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Main Project objectives

This project is an integral part of CACILM CPP that was approved by GEF Council in August 2006). In accordance with CACILM’s National Programming Framework (NPF), the project’s strategy is to generate from the vast rangelands a stable supply of products from livestock for consumption, processing and for export. This will contribute to ecosystem integrity and will ensure sustainable incomes and support the reduction of poverty among the most affected population. Degradation caused by overgrazing of areas close to villages and farms and underutilisation of remote rangelands will be stopped and reversed, resulting in a balanced use of rangelands with positive impacts on global environmental issues. The project envisages reviving mobile grazing systems, including a supportive legal and institutional environment, technical assistance, facilitation of organisational agreements and support for investments into the local infrastructure. Local structures for pasture management will be created.

**Objective:**

Demonstration of good practice in rangeland management that promotes both the ecological integrity of natural grasslands and rural livelihood.

There are four outcomes and associated outputs and activities, which contribute towards achieving the project objective, the demonstration of best practice of sustainable rangeland management.

Outcomes:

1. An environment which is conducive to Sustainable Rangeland Management (SRM) enhanced at the central and local levels.

2. Capacities and knowledge on integrated SRM of local government, community-based structures and individual farmers strengthened

3. Local infrastructure that allows greater mobility of livestock herds improved

4. Learning, evaluation and adaptive management, implemented.

The project has its focus on local level through working directly with the target groups, local communities. It will, however, also influence the regional (oblast) and national levels in order to create an enabling environment necessary to create successful models.

The Implementation of the Project started in April 2009, completion is planned for March 2012. The total project budget is US$ 3,763,000 with GEF financing of US$ 950,000, GTZ financing US$ 400,000, UNDP financing US$ 50,000 and US$ 2,363,000 in-kind contribution from Kazakh ministries and organizations. The executing agency for the project is the Ministry of Agriculture of the RK.

**Objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

Evaluation Audience

The mid-term evaluation of the UNDP/GEF/GTZ Project “Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural livelihood and Environmental Integrity” is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to provide the Project Implementation Unite with strategy and policy options for achieving the project’s expected results in a more effective and efficient manner and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

Purpose

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective so far, and to produce possible recommendations on how to improve the management of the project until its completion in March 2012.

Project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework.

The Mid-term Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

1. To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
2. To ensure accountability for the achievement of the objectives;
3. To enhance organizational and development learning;
4. To enable informed decision-making.

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

###### Project concept and design

The evaluators 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, examine relevance of the project’s outcomes/outputs and whether they provide the most effective route towards results. 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 joint project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of co-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.

**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 immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project against the Project’s logical framework. 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.

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

* test and confirm the key hypotheses underlying the project
* reassess risks and assumptions
* examine to which degree cross-sectoral issues such as gender mainstreaming have been taken into account
* present initial lessons learnt about project design, implementation and management

###### Project’s Adaptive Management Framework

1. Monitoring Systems: 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?

Reconstruct baseline data if necessary. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise. Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements.

1. Risk Management: Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
2. Work Planning: 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-GTZ requirements in terms of format and content. Assess the use of routinely updated workplans. Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities. Are work planning processes result-based? Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
3. Reporting: Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management. Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

###### Underlying Factors

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. Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made. Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project

###### UNDP Contribution

Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Please consider (1) field visits; (2) Steering Committee meetings; (3) PIR preparation and follow-up; (4) GEF guidance. Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide[[1]](#footnote-1), especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework. 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 skills to the project management.

###### Partnership Strategy

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.

Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships. 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. Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

**Scope of the Evaluation**

Although the Rangeland Management Project covers only four Selskij Okrugi it involves various stakeholders with differing, sometimes opposing interests. Thus it would be valuable to the Project success and conservation if the evaluation team would assess during the mid-term evaluation the involvement of the stakeholders (partnerships) – to highlight any successful examples and to identify any risks or gaps in their involvement.

Ownership of the Project by the Ministry of Agriculture will be one of the key factors in the Project’s success and thus, the evaluators are asked to make an objective assessment of the ownership of the project outcomes/results by the Ministry of Agriculture, as well as to provide recommendations to ensure this ownership by the end of the project in March 2012.

**Products expected from the evaluation**

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English and Russian that should, at least, include the following contents:

* 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
* An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
* Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance)
* Project formulation
  + - Implementation approach
    - Country ownership
    - Stakeholders participation
    - Replication approach
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector
    - Management arrangements
* Implementation
  + - Financial planning
    - Monitoring and evaluation
    - Execution and implementation modalities
    - Management by the UNDP country office
    - Coordination and operation issues
    - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
* Results
  + - Attainment of objective
    - Prospects of sustainability
* Conclusions and recommendations
* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
* Lessons learned
* Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.
* Annexes: TOR, itinerary, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

The length of the mid-term evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

**Evaluation approach**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below, however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[[2]](#footnote-2)). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

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

Evaluators should seek guidance for their work in the following materials, which could be found at (www.undp.org/gef):

* UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
* UNDP/GEF M&E Resource Kit
* Measuring Results of the GEF Biodiversity Programme

The Mid-Term Evaluation will be done through a combination of processes including a desk study, site visits, meetings and interviews with all stakeholders. The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation review (desk study) - the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in the Annex 1 to the Terms of Reference;
* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP Kazakhstan, GTZ Regional Program Director, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, Administration of PAs located in the project territory, project team, local municipalities, local communities and NGOs;
* Field visits;
* Questionnaires;
* And other methods for the gathering and analysis of data.

**Evaluation team**

The Mid-term Evaluation will be carried out by team of two external consultants:

* International consultant - expert in areas of international projects’ monitoring and evaluation with the focus on land management, creating sustainable rangeland practices;
* National consultant – expert in areas of environmental management, rangeland management, additional knowledge on NGO/indigenous community would be an asset

**Required Skills and Experience**

* 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 and impact-monitoring of GTZ;
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
* Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of biodiversity;
* Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Kazakhstan;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
* Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects;
* Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Excellent English/Russian communication skills.

**Duties and Responsibilities**

The evaluation team is responsible for the successful completion of the evaluation and finalizing the Mid-term Evaluation report. The team is expected to be familiar with the region and have basic knowledge of the project area (such as region’s biodiversity, socio-economic and legislative context, problems of rangeland management and agriculture)

Specifically, the international expert (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

* To lead and manage the evaluation mission;
* To design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* To determine terms of reference of the national consultant(s)
* To decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
* To conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
* To draft related parts of the evaluation report;
* To finalize the whole evaluation report.

The National Consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the International Consultant with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the national expert will perform tasks with a focus on:

* To review documents;
* To prepare a list of the outputs and impacts achieved under project;
* To organize the mission program and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
* To participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
* To conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs, impacts and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
* To draft related parts of the evaluation report;
* To assist Team leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections;
* To proof reading of the Russian version.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for a position. Applications are welcome from anyone who feels they can contribute to the team because they possess three or more of the listed qualities. Obviously the more qualities that can be demonstrated, the better the chance of selection.

Joint proposals from two independent evaluators are welcome. Or alternatively, proposals will be accepted from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team with the required expertise within the evaluation budget.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles[[3]](#footnote-3):

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

The evaluators 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 project policy-making process and/or its implementation. Any previous association with the project, Ministry of Agriculture or PAs administration in the Project territory, the Ministry of Environmental Protection, UNDP-Kazakhstan 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 individual evaluators are selected, UNDP will appoint one Team Leader. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

**Implementation Arrangements**

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

**Competencies**

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 Russian and English.

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor, GTZ Regional Program Director, the Project Director and members of the project steering group members.

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 report should be submitted to UNDP Country Office in Kazakhstan (to the attention of Ms. Victoria Baigazina Programme Associate, e-mail address: [victoria.baigazina@undp.org](mailto:victoria.baigazina@undp.org); mailing address: UNDP Kazakhstan, 26, Bukey Khan Street, 010000 Astana, Kazakhstan, tel. (+7-7172) 59-25-50)

The activities and timeframe are broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframes and responsibilities** |
| Desk review | 3 days – international expert (beginning of August), 5 days – national expert (end of July and beginning of August) |
|  |  |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaire, debriefing, briefing of evaluation consultants | 7 days – international expert, 7 days – national expert (mid of August) |
| Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings, and other types of feedback mechanisms | 5 days – evaluation team (mid of August) |
| Preparation of final evaluation report (including comments) | 5 days - international expert, (August and September) 13 days - national expert (August and September) |

*Working days:*

Team Leader (international expert) – 20 working days

National expert – 30 working days

The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Kazakhstan are suggested for 2-13 August 2007.

The final version of the report has to be delivered with the end of the contract on 12 September 2010.

**Annex 1. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators**

The 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  GEF/UNDP quarterly progress reports |
| Annual Project Report to GEF | Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) |
| Minutes | Steering group meetings  Meetings with experts, team staff etc. |
| Other relevant materials: |  |
| Information materials produced by the project activities | * Geo-Botanical research report of the project area * Report about inventorying pasture infrastructure of the Project territory * Pilot (Investment) projects documents * Report on livestock distribution and usage of the distant pastures * Report on conditions of pastures irrigation objects (wells etc) of the project area * Program for restoration and improvement of rangelands developed * Information-training programs of KazAgroInnovation on agriculture for local population, nature users and framers. * Program on awareness raising in the field of Sustainable Pasture Management. * Maps on Land users, including pasture resources * Documents on raising of awareness and informing population and stakeholders (web-site, articles, video, environmental campaigns) * Socio-economical research of the project area |



# Annex 2 Schedule of meetings and field visits

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Actions | Responsible of the project |
| 13.09. | 18.00 | Arrival in Almaty  device in the hotel | Yersain Kabdushev |
| 14.09 | 9.00 | Arrival to the office of the project, meeting with staff, work in the office (clarifying action program, interview the Project Manager, The Chief Technical Advisor, GTZ, Expert-coordinator Rangeland and Capacity Building, the Livestock Sector and Pasture monitoring Expert, the Awareness Raising and PR Expert, the Project Assistant, the Financing Assistant Translator, GTZ) | Dinara Yerezhepova |
| 15.09 | 8.00-19.00 | Field trip to the project area on the pilot project’s territories in Shien and Ulguli village districts | Yermek Sharip |
| 16.09 | 9.00-19.00 | Working with documents in the office of the project, interview experts | Dinara Yerezhepova |
| 17.09 | 8.00-19.00 | Field trip in Aidarly and to the project area on the pasture “Bassu” | Yermek Sharip |
| 18.09 | 9.00-18.00 | Work in the office (familiarity with the documentation, presentations of project experts) | Experts |
| 19.09. | 9.30 – 18.00 | Working with documents, preparing the evaluation report | International Expert John Leake,  National Experts Azhigaliyev Erken, Bekturova Gulnar |
| 20.09 | 6.10 | Departure to Astana | John Leake,  Azhigaliyev Erken, Bekturova Gulnar |
| 20.09 | 7.55 | Arrival to Astana | John Leake,  Azhigaliyev Erken, Bekturova Gulnar |
| 20.09 | 10.00 | Meeting with the National Project Director – Omarov Sapar | UN office in Astana |
| 20.09 | 15.00 | Meeting with the Deputy of Resident Representative of UNDP in Kazakhstan Steliana Ntdera. Presentation from John Leake. | UN office in Astana |
| 20.09 | 20.55 | Departure to Almaty | John Leake,  Azhigaliyev Erken, Bekturova Gulnar |
| 22.35 | Arrival to Almaty | John Leake,  Azhigaliyev Erken, Bekturova Gulnar |
| 21.09. | 9.00 – 18.00 | Working in the office | Experts |
| Departure to the airport and fly to Australia | Expert John Leake |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 

# Annex 3 People Interviewed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | |  |
| № | Name | Position | Contact | Mobile | E-mail |
| 1 | Steliana Nedera | Deputy of Resident Representative of UNDP in Kazakhstan, | +7 (7172) 592 550 (ext) 2112 |  | [steliana.nedera@undp.org](mailto:steliana.nedera@undp.org) |
| 2 | Vladimir Mamaev | UNDP |  |  | [vladimir.mamaev@undp.org](mailto:vladimir.mamaev@undp.org) |
| 3 | Victoria Baigazina | Coordinator of the Department of Environment and Energy | 8 701 81 48 885  8 777 234 05 58 |  | [Victoria.Baigazina@undp.org](mailto:Victoria.Baigazina@undp.org) |
| 4 | Reinkhard Bodemeyer | GTZ |  |  | [Reinhard.Bodemeyer@gtz.de](mailto:Reinhard.Bodemeyer@gtz.de) |
| 5  6 | Sapar Omarov  Bakhtiyar Sadyk | National Director  Of Project  Expert of management Nature resources | 8 701 218 73 85  8 701 221 80 11 |  | [Omarov\_s@minagri.kz](mailto:Omarov_s@minagri.kz)  [b.sadyk@mail.ru](mailto:b.sadyk@mail.ru) |
| 7 | Yerzhan Baltayev | Project Manager | +7(701) 555 57 16 |  | [Yerzhan.baltayev@undp.org](mailto:Yerzhan.baltayev@undp.org) |
| 8 | Hieno Hertel | The Chief Technical Advisor, GTZ | +7(705) 953 06 33 |  | [Heino.hertel@gtz.de](mailto:Heino.hertel@gtz.de) |
| 9 | Dinara Yerezhepova | Expert-coordinator Rangeland and Capacity Building | +7(702)953 06 33 |  | [Dinara.yerezhepova@undp.org](mailto:Dinara.yerezhepova@undp.org) |
| 10 | Yermek Sharip | Livestock Sector and Pasture monitoring Expert | +7(701) 322 15 20 |  | [Yermek.sharip@undp.org](mailto:Yermek.sharip@undp.org) |
| 11 | Baglan Kulumbayeva | Awareness Raising and PR Expert | +7(777) 729 17 57 |  | [Baglan.kulumbayeva@undp.org](mailto:Baglan.kulumbayeva@undp.org) |
| 12 | Yersain Kabdushev | Project Assistant | +7(701) 777 86 34 |  | [Yersain.kabdushev@undp.org](mailto:Yersain.kabdushev@undp.org) |
| 13 | Yelena Kazachkova | Financing Assistant Translater | +7(777) 147 25 79 |  | [Yelena.kazachkova@gtz.de](mailto:Yelena.kazachkova@gtz.de) |
| 14 | Bazarbaev Almas | Expert of water recourses | 8 701 78 49 945 |  | [Abazarbayev48@mail.ru](mailto:Abazarbayev48@mail.ru) |
| 15 | Baisariev Adilzhan | Akim of the Shien village district | 8 727 70 43 043 |  |  |
| 16 | Baishilekov Tursybai | PC chairman, Shien | 8 727 70 43 012 |  |  |
| 17 | Nikitina Irina | Member of the farm “Madina”, Shien | 8 727 70 43 116 |  |  |
| 18 | Kudebaev Muratbek | Head of the farm “Bolashak”, Shien | 8 727 70 43 047 |  |  |
| 19 | Tlepbergenov Aben | Chairmen of council of elders, Shien | 8 727 70 43 097 |  |  |
| 20 | Satubaldiev Masymkhan | Technician- inseminator, Shien | 8 727 70 43 027 |  |  |
| 21 | Bulgakova Nyrymgul | Member of the farm “Zhanyshkaly Eldar”, Shien | 8 727 70 43 068 |  |  |
| 22 | Amirbaev Marat | Head of the farm “Ardak”, Shien | 8 727 70 40 303 |  |  |
| 23 | Ekeibekov Beisembai | Local resident, Shien | 8 727 70 43 010 |  |  |
| 24 | Zhamanov Zhakbai | Head of the farm “Izbai”, Shien |  |  |  |
| 25 | Seitov Omentai | Local resident, Shien | 8 727 70 43 018 |  |  |
| 26 | Samutdinov Sembai | Head of the farm, Karabastau, Matybulak village district |  |  |  |
| 27 | Ainabekov Beisembek | Akim of the Aidarly village | 8 727 59 41 544 |  |  |
| 28 | Aldanov Salamat | Chairmen of the Pasture Committee | 8 727 59 41 518 |  |  |
| 29 | Auten Abdulmajit | Oralman from China, member of the PC |  |  |  |
| 30 | Doldai Kolkei Uly | Oralman from Mongolia |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Annex 4 List of documents reviewed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Request for CEO endorsement/Approval Project Type: Medium-sized  Project the GEF Trust Fund |  |
| 2. UNDP Project Document. UNDP-GEF Medium-Size Project (MSP). Government of Kazakhstan United Nations Development Programme, Additional partners: GTZ. PIMS 3819 CACILM CPP: Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural Livelihood and Environmental Integrity | PIU |
| 3. Project Inception Report, May 2009 | PIU |
| 4. Financial information: cumulative from project start to June 30 2010 | PIU |
| 5. Rating of Implementation Progress (PIR) |  |
| 6. Project stakeholder overview, Project Implementation Unit, Revised Project Framework Matrix | PIU |
|  |  |
| 7. Terms of Reference the Consultant on carrying out the mid-term evaluation UNDP/GEF/GTZ Project “Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural livelihood and Environmental Integrity” | PIU |
| 8. Project Implementation Plan for the Project period | PIU |
| 9. Project Work Implementation Plan for Year 1 | PIU |
| 10. Annual Work Plan for 2010 | PIU |
| 11. Detailed annual work plan for 2010 | PIU |
| 12. Plan of the Management of the Knowledge SRM, 2010 | PIU |
| 13. GTZ annual report 2009 | PIU |
| 14. Annual Progress Report 2009 | PIU |
| 15. Quarterly Progress Report January-March 2010 | PIU |
| 16. Quarterly Progress Report April-June 2010 | PIU |
| 17. PR strategy of the project «Sustainable rangeland management for rural livelihood and environmental integrity» | PIU |
| 18.Pilot projects suggested for implementation in 2010-2011 within the joint project “Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural Livelihood and Environmental Integrity” in Zhambyl Rayon of Almaty Oblast. | Centre for Remote Sensing and GIS “TERRA” |
| 29. Traditional Land Management Knowledge in Central Asia | UNDP |
| 20. Geo-botanical monitoring | PIU |
| 21. Socio-economical monitoring | PIU |
| 22. Report on pasture irrigation in Aydarly, Matybulak, Ulguli and Shiyen Village Districts, 2010 | PIU |
| 23. Analysis of existing economic, finance and other methods stimulation  of the SRM on the project’s area | PIU |
| 24. Protocol of the meeting №1 Steering Committee of the project  «Sustainable Rangeland Management for rural livelihood and  environmental integrity», Almaty, 24 July 2009 | PIU |
| 25. Protocol of the meeting №2 Steering Committee of the project  «Sustainable Rangeland Management for rural livelihood and  environmental integrity», Astana, 7.12. 2009 | PIU |
| 26. Protocol of the meeting №3 of the Steering Committee “Sustainable  rangeland management for rural livelihood and environmental integrity”,  Project territory: Ulguli, Shien, 20 August 2010 | PIU |
| 27. An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs  and the partnership strategy | PIU |
|  |  |
| Other project documents and publications٭ |  |

٭List of publications annexed

# Annex 5 List of Project Publications

**List of Publications**

List of the Project’s prospectuses

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| № | Name of the Printers | Language | Edition |
| 1. | Booklet “Pasturage Committees or Revival of Jailau” | Russian | 100 |
| 2. | Booklet “Pasturage Committees or Revival of Jailau” | Kazakh | 200 |
| 3. | Booklet “*Agropyron fragile* – valuable heavy forage crop” | Russian | 1000 |
| 4. | Booklet “*Agropyron fragile* – valuable heavy forage crop” | Kazakh | 1600 |
| 5. | Brochure «Project Sustainable Rangeland Management for rural livelihood and environmental integrity» | Kazakh, Russian, English | 1000 |
| 6. | Booklet about Project SRM | Kazakh, Russian, English | 1000 |
| 7. | Flyer | Kazakh, Russian, English | 1000 |
| 8. | Billboards | Kazakh | 5 |
| 9. | Roll-billboards | Kazakh, Russian, English | 3 |
| 10. | Picture-cards with children pictures | Kazakh | 150 |
| 11. | Information desks about Project | Kazakh | 4 |

# Annex 6 Detailed Analysis of the situation

**ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS AND PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY FOR 2009-2010**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expected MSP results and indicators including annual outcomes** | **Planned arrangements, list of arrangements including M&E carried out during the year for stated results of MSP activity** | **Timetable** | | | | | | **Indicators** | **Action Taken** | **Action not yet Taken** | **Comments and Recommendation** |
| **2009** | | **2010** | | | |
| q  3 | q  4 | q  1 | q  2 | q  3 | q  4 |
| **1. An environment which is conductive to Sustainable Rangeland Management (SRM) enhanced at the central and local level** | ***1.1 Review of the regulatory instruments, identification of shortcomings and elaboration proposals for amendments*** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.Agrarian lows for SRM  2.Coordinated unit (Pasture Committees) |  |  | *This component is to be undertaken after a National Roundtable Conference at the end of the year that will be based on studies and experience during this year* |
|  | Analyze the problems on land use situation on a regular base | x |  | x | x | x | x |  | PIU has received from Republican State Enterprise "State Scientific-Production Center of Land Resources and Land Management" list of the methodical and instructive documents on survey work within village settlement territory |  | It is advisable to organize a National Roundtable with participation other same projects |
|  | ***1.2. Identification and promotion of economic and other incentives for SRM*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Analyze the economic situation of livestock keepers in 4 Selskii Okrug | q  1 | q  2 |  | x | x |  |  | 1. In 2009 the project has signed a contract with an expert on financial enhancement mechanisms of sustainable pasture resources management (SRM) | It’s been done |  |
|  | Assess the financial viability of SRM (assessment of the need for providing continuous financial support to SRM) |  | x | x |  |  |  |  | 2. The expert assessed economic efficiency of SRM in December 2009, conduction of needs assessment in permanent financial support of SRM (potential sources: payments for environmental services, national budget and micro lending).  3. Studied existing agriculture support programs availability of economic methods of SRM.  4. Conducted assessment and analysis of awareness level within target groups on existing support, subsidies for agriculture.  5. Entities identified from the target groups using economic methods of SRM |  | Disseminate in 4 villages information about the existent methods of economic stimulation of agriculture and SRM in Kazakhstan |
|  | Elaborate a scenario for the development of the rangelands in the 4 Selskii Okrug taking into account economic, ecological and legal aspects |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | It’s been done |  |
|  | Develop guideline for herders to improve pastures and identify general possibilities of support to the livestock keepers |  |  | x | x |  |  |  | Not yet ready | The guideline for herders to improve pastures will be prepared in 4 quarter of 2010 | The guideline is necessary to publish and disseminate in 4 Selskii Okrug as soon as possible |
|  | Different methods of SRM encouragement are developed and proposed (ex. Creation of financial mechanism tool for self-financing) among local people |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  | This arrangement will make in 4 quarter 2010 |  |
|  | ***1.3 Study on marketing of livestock and on processing of livestock products*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Write terms of reference and give out a contract to a marketing expert |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | Project implementation unit don’t find an expert to this position |  |  |
|  | Prepare the study with economic analysis of the market for livestock products |  |  | x | x |  |  |  | Not yet ready | This arrangement will make in 4 quarter 2010 |  |
|  | Working out of proposals for improvement of distribution channels of livestock products |  |  | x | x |  |  |  | Not yet ready | This arrangement will make in 4 quarter 2010 |  |
|  | ***1.4 Establishment of a co-ordinating Pasture Committee (NGO) in each of the 4 Selskii Okrug*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *This has been achieved and is an important success* |
|  | Carrying out of PC sessions, in accordance with Statute | x | x |  | x |  | x |  | 1. Studied experience of other projects on creation of institutional models based on good practices achieving land use sustainability in order to create Pasture committees |  |  |
|  | Making and implementation of proposals for effective work of Pasture Committee | x |  | x | x | x | x |  | 2. Pasture committee status is coordinated with local authorities through signing a Treaty and approval of a template of the Treaty on Pasture Committee.  3. Four Pasture committees created in four Selski Okrugis based on open election of members at joint meeting of pasture resources users. Approved statute on the Pasture Committee by pasture resources users.  4. Contracts with the four Pasture committees’ chairmen were signed and concluded. And certificates had been provided to the Pasture committee chairmen |  |  |
|  | Compare the suitability of the “Pasture Committee” with other institutional models how to best achieve sustainability | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | In March 2010 Project organized an International conference “Experience of introducing innovative approaches of sustainable agriculture in productive landscapes”, where was discussed and compared the Pasture Committee as a institutional model |  |  |
| **2. Capacities and knowledge on integrated SRM of local government, community-based structures and individual farmers strengthened** | ***2.1 A better public understanding of rangeland degradation both as an environmental and socio-economic problem which seriously affects local livelihood and regional development*** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. Number of publications  2. Agreement about the regulation of pasturage  3. Number of people studied the methods of SRM |  |  | *The activities planned to date have been implemented* |
|  | Development of the plan of activities for better understanding of degradation problems, and project aims and outcomes | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | The project has signed a contract with an expert on public relations and awareness in order to provide with informational support to the Project through setting up connection with partners at all levels. The expert is responsible for development and implementation of the awareness strategy for target groups of the Project on national and local levels.  Conducted analysis of awareness level between the target groups on SRM role, as well as developed response measures, actions and materials towards creation of favorable environment, capacity building within the target group and elimination of barriers enabling pasture degradation process through training strategy development (schedule, content and topic of trainings)  Developed PR strategy (awareness campaign) on comprehension improvement of degradation problems and its environmental and socio-economic consequences having a significant impact on wellbeing of local community and region development |  |  |
|  | Implement the plan of activities for better understanding of degradation problems, and project aims and outcomes | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | In May, ‘MIR’ international TV station has recorded a video coverage on the project. Length of the footage is 5 minutes. The video was screened at the end of May 2009.  Project National Manager and Chief Technical Adviser were interviewed about the project for ‘Kazyna’ magazine by INTER NEWS KZ reporter in the beginning of May 2009.  National Project Manager had been interviewed by mass media representatives, like ‘Aikyn’ newspaper, ‘Khabar zher’ – one of the main National wide TV programs on Agricultural land use issues.  Project implementation unit has organized visits to other projects for experience exchange within the field visit part of the International scientific-practical conference "Experience of introducing innovative approaches of sustainable agriculture in productive landscapes" for 4 representatives of the Project’s target group (two chairmen and one member of Pasture committees and one auyl okrug (village) Akim) to the farm ‘Karanaiza’ and LLP ‘KazGer’ in Akmola oblast to enable them to see wind waterpower and livestock management in the livestock camp in the distant pastures.  PIU has published brochures and booklets about the Project, billboards of the project and four boxes for the villagers proposal reception had also been installed in 4 auyl okrug (Project area) to raise attention of the villagers to the project and land degradation problems.  PIU to raise attention of the pupils to the project and land degradation problems has started competition on best pasture and livestock pictures in the project area.  PIU jointly with KazAgroInnovation JSC organized the seminar on veterinary protection between 15th and 19th February for all Veterinary staff of the Zhambyl rayon.  Studied existing training conduction modules for human development capacity building on improvement of sustainable pasture management practices.  Developed strategy for training conduction (schedule, content and topics) in order to build capacity within target group and eliminate barriers enabling pasture degradation process on the project territory  Conducted awareness raising introductory trainings in four Selski Okrugis on 11-15 May 2009 on project start up in order to get local community and authorities acquainted with goals, tasks and events of the project.  Conducted introductory workshop on 20 November 2009 for selected chairmen of the Pasture committees with a visit to the Project Office in Almaty in order to discuss details of the Pasture committee’s functions. |  |  |
|  | ***2.3 Establish a system of knowledge management to ensure that information and experiences are made available to other CACILM projects and elsewhere*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Conducted joint national level training for local non-governmental organizations on lobbying strategies, program development tools, projects and applications, as well as a workshop on development of tools enabling larger participation of civil society in UNCCD activity process and desertification problems in cooperation with the Central Asian Regional Environmental Center project ‘Drynet’ on 1-4 December 2009 in Almaty. |  | *The activities planned to date have been implemented* |
|  | Write terms of reference and give out a contract to IT expert |  |  | x | x | x |  |  | Project implementation group took part in a workshop organized by CACILM in Almaty on 18-20 May 2009 – Informational Systam of Sustainable Rangeland Management (IS0LRM). The National Manager conducted presentation of the Project. Lead expert on pasture resources conducted guide-presentation of the project territory.  Conducted meeting with the project “Demonstration of sustainable mountain pasture management in Suusamyr valley, Kyrgyzstan’, in Bishkek. Set up mutual connection on exchange and cooperation between the projects.  National Project Manager and Chief Expert on Pasture Resources and Capacity Building took part in a workshop of the project of the International Scientific and Technical Center K-1396r ‘Reclamation of regular monitoring of pasture lands in Kazakhstan based on satellite and space and land information in context of profitable domestic utilization, pasture land desertification slowdown and CO2 balance stabilization in atmosphere’ on 15 September 2009. The workshop contained discussion of modern pasture land monitoring system based on space and land information in order to receive agricultural and environmental information.  Reserved domain of the envisaged project website: www.zhailau.kz. |  |  |
| Write terms of reference and give out a contract to an Adviser on knowledge Management |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Develop website (portal) of the project |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Development of the knowledge management plan, which will help for integration, exchange and availability of data and information of the project |  | x |  | x |  |  |
| Participate in professional events, present the project and learn from others | x | x | x | x | x | x |
|  | Establish intense co-operation between the CACILM projects in Central Asia (field visits, exchange of material) | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | National Manager of the Project took part in the first workshop of the Central Asian Countries Initiative on Land Management (CACILM) in Tashkent on 20 November 2009. The workshop contained discussion on experience share on institutional and technical issues, as well as opportunities of taking advantages of belonging to CACILM. |  |  |
|  | ***2.4 Greater awareness and capacities of the role of SRM for rural growth among decision-makers on local (rayon) and regional (oblast) level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *The activities planned to date have been implemented* |
|  | Find projects of good SRM practise, videos and/or slide shows | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | 1. Project organized the Regular meetings and study of other project experience on pasture resources management for further application in the project or demonstration and presentation of the for the target group.  2. An opportunity of visiting area of other project in order to share experience in 2010 is considered. |  |  |
|  | Consider the possibility of best practices use within the project by the demonstration of video, photo documentations and presentations | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | There have been 41 project publications in the media.  PIU has published brochures and booklets about the Project, billboards of the project and four boxes for the villagers proposal reception had also been installed in 4 auyl okrug (Project area) to raise attention of the villagers to the project and land degradation problems. |  |  |
|  | Organise field visits to these good examples of effective SRM (using outcome results 2.2) |  | x |  | x |  |  |  | On 5 March Project implementation unit organized field visit for some of Steering Committee members to demonstrate the works for implementation of the pilot projects starting from April |  |  |
|  | Present the project and SRM at various workshops and seminars organised in the Almaty Oblast | x | x |  | x |  | x |  | PIU jointly with KazAgroInnovation JSC organized the seminar on veterinary protection between 15th and 19th February for all Veterinary staff of the Zhambyl rayon |  |  |
| **3. Local infrastructure that allows greater mobility of livestock herds improved** | ***3.1 Survey on the natural and socio-economic potential for livestock of the 4 Selskii Okrug pilot area*** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. Number of the investment plans of the Members local communities  2. Infrastructures on the Pastures  3. Using of the distant pastures | 1. Project implementation group conducted socio-economic and geobotanic research of 4 Selski Okrugi in order to assess capacity for cattle breeding and income level amongst households and farmers.  2. The project developed cartographic materials in cooperation with the State Research Institute ‘National Production Center of Land Issues’ (DGP KIO NPCZEM); the maps are scaled in 1:50 in accordance with description of the existing geobotanic reports on 4 villages districts to the developed cartographic materials. Copies of the cartographic materials data are possessed.  3. The geobotanic research identified and determined eight test (environmental) site on the project territory.  Project implementation unit signed a contract with the GIS specialist to make GIS mapping.  4. Monitoring of real conditions of livestock droves and the usage of winter pastures of the project area with identifying regulations of its usage (livestock distribution) had been completed.  5. Project implementation unit has finalized conclusion of the Grant agreements with beneficiaries according to the pilot projects. All necessary materials and documents had been purchased and prepared respectively to implement the pilot projects | It’s been done | *The activities planned to date have been implemented* |
| Monitoring of real conditions of livestock droves and rangelands (quantities and semiquantitive methods including photo and video materials) |  |  |  | x | x | x |
| Carrying out of socio-economic surveys of 4 selskii okrugi | x | x |  | x | x |  |
| Select and train the survey team |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Annual inventory of objects of rangelands’ infrastructure |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Carrying out of other surveys if necessary |  |  |  | x | x |  |
|  | ***3.2 Land use plans that are negotiated and agreed upon by all relevant stakeholders and are updated regularly as deems necessary*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Some planned activities, TOR and some plan ideas have been documented but this component is behind schedule due to difficulties finding appropriate staff* |
|  | Write terms of reference and give out a contract to Natural Resource and Land Use Planning Expert | x |  | x | x | x | x |  | The project has signed a contract with an expert on mutual land resources planning and nature resources management in order to study modern conditions and methods of agricultural activity, as well as submitting recommendations on sustainable agriculture practices, including practices of pasture resources management, adaptation of innovative and alternative approaches to land resources |  |  |
|  | Write terms of reference and give out a contract to international expert on Participatory Land Use Planning |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Work out and approval of plans for pastures use |  |  | x | x | x |  |  | Conducted inventory of pasture infrastructure facilities, and pasture classification identifying their utilization level.  On 26 October 2009, the Project has conducted first meeting of the Technical Group with consideration of 6 (six) investment projects where 3 (three) of them were approved:  1. Introduction of innovative approaches in sustainable pasture resources management in semi-desert zone of Almaty oblast in ‘Kali’ farm;  2. Accelerated recovery of pied-mountain fodder fields productivity in ‘Shanyshkyly Eldar’ farm;  3. Productivity increase of degraded fodder fields using environmentally sound technologies in ‘Karasai’ LLP.  4. Remaining investment project for implemented in 2010 are followed on |  |  |
|  | Establish clear rules and regulations for pastures use near villages (Note: the Pasture Committee of output 1.4 plays an important role establishing land use plans.) |  |  | x | x | x |  |  | The Project proposed creation of the Technical Group in order to consider small-scale pilot projects and assessment of their match with elaborated principles and selection criteria determined in the PMC Charter, as well as further identification of pilot projects. In accordance of the PMC Minutes #1 as 27 July 2009, the Group includes:  1. The National Project Manager (Chairman of the Commission)  2. GEF PMG Representative in Kazakhstan,  3. UNDP Project Coordinator (country office),  4. Deputy Akim of Zhambyl oblast,  5. Chief Technical Adviser (GTZ),  6. CACILM National Secretariat,  7. Representative from the Kazakh Scientific and Research Institute of Cattle breeding and Fodder Production. | The rules of the SRM will be ready in 4 quarter 2010 |  |
|  | Searching of encouragement possibilities for using distant pastures by investment projects | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | Tree investment projects, approved in 2009 have been implemented |  |  |
|  | ***3.3 Investment plans and specifications which reflect the requirements for decreasing land degradation and the priorities identified by local communities*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Many plans have been formulated and implemented , water rehabilitation activities have been delayed because the contracts are either too small and distant to attract the larger companies or that the smaller companies are not considered reliable enough, this is the most highly valued investment* |
|  | Derive from meetings with villagers a list of real needs for decreasing land degradation and mobilization of the use of distant pastures, e.g. fodder production, storing hay for winter time, improvement watering places, improvement of the genetic potential and animal health, improve physical structures | x | x | x | x | x | x |  | On 10 June Technical committee considered and approved 14 investment projects on the outrun of cattle to distant pastures and projects on pasture watering.  Project implementation unit has finalized conclusion of the Grant agreements with beneficiaries according to the pilot projects. All necessary materials and documents had been purchased and prepared respectively to implement the pilot projects. |  |  |
|  | Summarise proposals into the investment plans with cost estimates and give for the consideration of the technical group, created by the Steering committee according to the selection criteria | x |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
|  | Working out of TORs and giving out a contract with engineers or other relevant organizations for making up estimation |  |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |
|  | Support local people through Pasture committee in making out financial requests to other financial institutions or to organizations that support agriculture |  |  | x | x | x | x |  | The project is continuously seeking for the partners. The tight liaison was developed with “KazAgroInnovation” JSC, UNDP Kyrgyzstan (project) “Demonstrating Sustainable Mountain Pasture Management in the Susamyr Valley”, UNDP/GEF Project ‘Integrated Conservation of Priority Globally Significant Migratory Bird Wetlands Habitat: a Demonstration on Three Sites’ Kazakh Scientific Research Institute of Livestock Breeding and feed production, Kazakh Scientific Research Institute of Agro Industrial Complex Economy and Rural Development, *In situ* Conservation of Kazakhstan’s Mountain Agro-biodiversity UNDP\GEF project, the project «CACILM Sustainable Land Management Information System in Kazakhstan», SGP GEF, “**Sustainable Dairy Global Development Alliance” Winrock International project and** other UNDP/GEF projects. |  |  |
|  | ***3.4 Contributions to on-the-ground investments in local infrastructure needed for increasing the mobility of livestock and a more balanced use of rangelands*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Much has been achieved in this popular component, it is on time but there are doubts about the sustainability of gifted inputs. Justified as an experiment* |
|  | Scrutinise the technical and economic feasibility and viability of the proposals in the investment plans | x |  | x | x | x | x |  | 1. Clarified economic viability and technical capability of investment plans implementation, as well as contribution from beneficiaries.  2. Conducted tenders on purchase of multi-year grass seeds and diesel fuel.  3. Developing grant agreements with the beneficiaries for signing in order to confirm duties of the parties on legal basis and transfer of finalized investment projects.  4. The beneficiaries conduct preliminary activity for implementation of the investment plans |  |  |
|  | Agree upon the responsibility for the maintenance of the investment | x |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
|  | Agree upon the contributions of the concerned stakeholders | x |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
|  | Working out of TORs and giving out a contract with engineer or relevant organization for monitoring building or repair of objects of rangelands infrastructure |  |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
|  | Organize works on investment plans’ realization | x |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
|  | Monitoring of project implementation, pilot projects monitoring |  |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
|  | Hand over the works to those responsible for the maintenance | x |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| **4. Learning, evaluation and adaptive management, implemented** | ***4.1 Monitoring and evaluation of the project’s performance*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. Created Project Management Committee during the first Committee meeting on 27 July 2009.  2. Project implementation division has developed the Project Management Committee Charter, as well as Principles and Criteria for selection of investment projects.  3. Adjusted project indicators during introductory project period.  4. Integrated gender aspects into various events of project implementation. For instance, participation of at least one woman in the committee was a mandatory rule upon creation of the Pasture committee.  5. The National Manager of the project took part in the UNDP training on procurement and HR recruiting conducted in UNDP Regional Office in Bratislava.  6. The National Project Manager and the Chief Technical Adviser tool part in a GTZ training in Khorog (Tajikistan) on improvement of monitoring system and evaluation.National Project Manager and Administrative and Financial Assistant took place on the Atlas training on 21 January in Astana, in order timely and properly fulfillment of demanded reports and information.  7. Project implementation unit organized field visit on 5th March for the National Project Director with the participation of Programme Associate UNDP in Kazakhstan, Expert on strategic Planning Management of Ministry of Environmental protection of Kazakhstan, two scientific representatives of the Kazakh Scientific Research Institute of Livestock Breeding and feed production in order to see the preparation of the project for the implementation of the pilot project starting from April.  8. Project implementation unit together with “KazAgroInnovation” JSC, SGP GEF and UNDP/GEF Project ‘Integrated Conservation of Priority Globally Significant Migratory Bird Wetlands Habitat: a Demonstration on Three Sites’ organized an International scientific-practical conference "Experience of introducing innovative approaches of sustainable agriculture in productive landscapes" on 18-19 March in Astana in order to receive best practices on Rangeland management |  | *Monitoring of outputs and project work plans happens. Some implementation lessons have been noted and acted on. However participatory monitoring of project outcomes as articulated in the project document has not yet begun in a formal way, pending the “learning for sustainability workshop” by Camp Alatoo* |
| Working out of TORs and giving out the contract to national consultant for med-term evaluation |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Working out of TORs and giving out a contract to international consultant for med-term evaluation |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Carrying out of mid-term evaluation |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Visits to project territory |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Corrected project indicators |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Analysis of collected data, lessons learnt + its including into annual report |  |  | x | x | x | x |
| Perfection of monitoring and evaluation system (if necessary) |  | x |  | x |  | x |
| Ensure that project activities are carried out in a gender-sensitive way | x | x | x | x | x | x |
|  | ***4.2 Dissemination of project results and lessons learnt for replication*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *The planned activities have been undertaken and dissemination channels through media, other projects and CACILM. Established* |
|  | Compilation and dissemination of lessons from the pilot area in the form of policy guidance notes etc |  |  | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |
|  | Organization of activities with the visits to project area |  |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ***4.3 Adapted Annual Work Plans (AWP) that reflect the project’s continuous efforts for fully integrating lessons learnt into the project design*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *This project management activity apparently works well although there is evidence that coordinated planning between staff of the two agencies is not smooth* |
|  | Development of Annual Work Plans (AWP) that reflect the project’s continuous efforts for fully integrating lessons learnt into the project design |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | 1. Developed draft annual project work plan over the current year and the annual work plan for the next year.  2. Work Plan 2010 will be considered and discussed during the second Project Management Committee meeting on 7 December 2009 |  |  |
|  | Preparation of Project Implementation Annual report |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
|  | AWP approval from Steering Committee |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations

* We recommend that the project seek an extension to enable objectives to be achieved without interruption
* We recommend the co managers review their collaboration to facilitate smoother implementation and less staff changes by;
  + harmonising remuneration and working conditions between the staff of each partner, and
  + setting up a more formal agreement, perhaps following the private sector un incorporated joint venture model, which a management board and an over seeing agency board to decide in cases of deadlock
* We recommend facilitating the establishment of local contractors to repair wells and other infrastructure, possibly by providing some credit tied to certain service for named local government areas.
* There may be other such areas, such as for livestock transport where truck tray frameworks exist that can triple or quadruple the number that could be carried by existing trucks and trailers,

Recommendations (con’t)

* We recommend a review of local staff employment to identify the reasons for slowness in hiring local experts.
* We recommend a review of procurement procedures to identify better system to ensure supplies can be provided in the right season for efficient and effective operation.
* We recommend the project engage with the Ministry of Agriculture and other programmes and projects operating in the area to identify further opportunities for partnerships
* We recommend consideration of some more experimental activities to be derived from a more analytical assessment of the relevance of international experience to Kazakh conditions

1. UNDP Country Office can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See http://www.uneval.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See p.16 of the GEF’s Monitoring and Evaluation Policy [↑](#footnote-ref-3)