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**Overall comments:**

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.

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.

However, we recommend an extension of one year to give more time for the successful results to be demonstrated and additional work to improve sustainability.

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****.*

**Good practices and lessons learned:**

The establishment of pasture committees, 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.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | The recommendation will be discussed during the Steering Committee meeting to find opportunity for prolongation of project activities within new initiatives. The project team elaborated therefore an **exit strategy.** | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 1.1. Elaboration of exit strategy | Dec. 2010 | Project team |  |  |
| 1.2. Presentation of first draft of exit strategy at Steering Committee Meeting in Dec. 2010 | 14th Dec. 2010 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | There are protocols about all meetings, discussions and the development of the joint management. Lessons learnt will be elaborated at the end of the project.  So far, we recommend to work on a general Memorandum of Understanding between both agencies, concerning the joint management of projects. | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 2.1. contribute to proposal for MoA between UNDP and GTZ for joint management of projects | Feb. 2011 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3:** | We recommend a review of local staff employment to identify the reasons for slowness in hiring local experts | | | |
| **Management Response:** | There is a general problem with availability of local experts in Kazakhstan. It is improving with more knowledge exchange with other projects and closer cooperation with Kazakh institutions and organizations. | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 3.1. develop a pool of local experts | January 2011 | Project team |  |  |
| 3.2. review hired experts | January 2011 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | Procurement procedures take a certain time according to company regulations. Thus planning has to be in advance to ensure the delivery of supplies in time. The observed delay in repairing of wells and water points is solved. All work, planned for this year is completed. | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |  |
|  |  |  | **Status** | **Comments** |
| 4.1. planning of supplies until the end of the project | January 2011 | Project team |  |  |
| 4.2. ordering of supplies acc. to company regulations | as required | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | The Round Table conference 22 - 23 November 2010was a good step into this direction. The Ministry and KasAgroInnovatia are interested in the project results and ready for a closer cooperation.  Cooperation agreement between UNDP and Washington State University was signed in November 2010 | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |  |
|  |  |  | **Status** | **Comments** |
| 5.1. Assistance to MoA RK on development and making changes and amendments into existing legal and normative acts on SRM |  | Project team |  |  |
| 5.2. extended field trip to the project area with Min. of Agriculture, Steering Committee and other stakeholders | Sept. 2011 | Project team |  |  |
| 5.3. Monitoring and assessment of pilot project outcomes conducted in cooperation with the Washington State University (Sustainable agriculture program) | Oct. 2011 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | With the closer cooperation with the Rayon Akimat we will further discuss this question, also regarding the outscaling of the project. | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |  |
|  |  |  | **Status** | **Comments** |
| 6.1. Meeting National Project manager with Akim Rayon about outscaling of project results. | Dec. 2010 | Project team |  |  |
| 6.2. Conduction of trainings for dissemination of Pasture Committee work in other districts of Zhambyl Rayon of Almaty oblast. | Aug. - Nov. 2011 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 7:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | The Report on rangeland practice in 4 developed countries from Olga Weigel was presented at the Round Table Conference in November and found lots of interest both by the local people and Ministry of Agriculture.  In Aidarly Selskij Okrug, where about one quarter of the population are returned Kazakhs from China and Mongolia. These people are actively involved into the project implementation and members of the Pasture Committee. | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |  |
|  |  |  | **Status** | **Comments** |
| 7.1. Preparation of recommendations on promotion of economic and other methods of SRM incentives | Apr. - July 2011 | Project team |  |  |
| 7.2. Assistance to local communities in processing SGP grant applications | Apr. - Dec. 2011 | Project team |  |  |
| 7.3. To study mechanism of micro credits for agricultural producers and assist in processing of applications | Jan. - July 2011 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 8:** | 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 | | | |
| **Management Response:** | The project team is aware of this problem. First Agreements are worked out, signed and hardware is handed over to owners or users. | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |  |
|  |  |  | **Status** | **Comments** |
| 8.1. Agreements on use of 14 yurts signed by Akimats and Pasture Committees | Nov. 2010 | Project team |  |  |
| 8.2. Agreements on use of 10 yurts signed by Akimats and Pasture Committees | Dec. 2010 | Project team |  |  |
| 8.3. Completion of agreements on assets | March 2011 | Project team |  |  |
| 8.4. Control of proper use and maintanace of assets by Pasture Committees | May and November 2011 | Project team |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

\* The implementation status is tracked in the ERC.