



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

# TERMS OF REFERENCE

## International Consultant

### Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project

*“Strengthening the management effectiveness of the protected areas system of Turkmenistan”*  
*PIMS 3961*

### **Project background information, goal, objectives and outcomes**

The Project on “Strengthening the management effectiveness of the protected area system of Turkmenistan” (PAS project) is funded by Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by UNDP in close partnership with Ministry of Nature Protection, National Institute of Deserts, Flora and Fauna, Syunt-Hasardag Reserve, other reserves of Turkmenistan, research institutions, local government and communities.

The PAS Project started in 2010 and aims at creation an enabling environment for the establishment of a functional, effective and ecologically coherent system of protected areas. This project will complement the governmental efforts in expanding and strengthening the PA system with focus on two components: (i) Expanding protected area system to improve the representation and coverage; (ii) Supporting development of adequate systemic, institutional and individual capacity for management of the expanded protected area system.

For more detailed information about this project as well as other UNDP Turkmenistan environmental projects please visit: [www.undptkm.org](http://www.undptkm.org).

This project was designed to complement the government’s efforts in expanding and strengthening the Protected Areas System in Turkmenistan, and the project has the **objective** of ‘creating an enabling environment for the establishment of a functional, effective and ecologically coherent system of protected areas in Turkmenistan’. The project has two **components** – along with their associated outcomes, outputs and activities - which will contribute towards achieving the project objective. These are: **Component 1. Expanded Protected Areas System (PAS) to improve PA representation and coverage**; and **Component 2. Adequate institutional and individual capacity is in place for the management of the PAS**. The project will focus activities at two levels of intervention: (i) the national level, through working with public institutions and agencies in order to develop the capacity to consolidate, expand and effectively manage the PAS; and (ii) the local level, through working directly with the target groups and local communities in order to establish the first National Park in Turkmenistan in the Sumbar river valley in the SW Kopetdag mountains.

The Project Expected Outcomes are as follows:

### **Outcome 1**

Expanded Protected Area System (PAS) to improve PA representation and coverage:

- Improved coverage of the PA system to include under-represented desert ecosystems and regions notably the Balkhan and Central Karakum priority conservation areas;
- Enabling environment for an increased area of individual protected areas and the whole system;
- First National Park established as a model for this protected area management category in Turkmenistan (approx. 300,000 ha)

## **Outcome 2**

Adequate institutional and individual capacity is in place for the management of the PAS:

- Enhanced capacity of the protected area institutions to implement the protected area system plan (measured by the Institutional scorecard and METT);
- Improved inter-institutional cooperation and collaboration over natural resources conservation and management.

**Project Summary Table**

|                                 |  |   |  |                               |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Project Title:</b>           | Strengthening the management effectiveness of the protected areas system of Turkmenistan |   |  |                               |
| <b>GEF Project ID:</b>          | PIMS 3961  |   | <i>at endorsement<br/>(Million US\$)</i> | <i>at MTE (Million US\$)</i>  |
| <b>UNDP Project ID:</b>         | 00071171   | <b>GEF financing:</b>                         | 0.95                                     | 0.95                          |
| <b>Country:</b>                 | Turkmenistan   | <b>IA/EA own:</b>                             | n/a                                      | n/a                           |
| <b>Region:</b>                  | Central Asia   | <b>Government:</b>                            | 0.59 in-kind                             | 0.59 in kind                  |
| <b>Focal Area:</b>              | Biodiversity   | <b>Other:</b>                                 | UNDP 0.06                                | 0.006                         |
| <b>FA Objectives, (OP/SP):</b>  | (SP) 3 of SO 1, 'Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks'.                     | <b>Total co-financing:</b>                    | n/a                                      | n/a                           |
| <b>Executing Agency:</b>        | Ministry of Nature Protection  | <b>Total Project Cost in cash:</b>            | 1.01                                     | 1.01                          |
| <b>Other Partners involved:</b> | Succow Fund  | <b>ProDoc Signature (date project began):</b> |  | October 2009                  |
|                                 |  | <b>(Operational) Closing Date:</b>            | <b>Initial:</b><br>Dec. 2012             | <b>Proposed:</b><br>Dec. 2013 |

## ***1. Introduction***

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, In accordance with the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedures the mid-term evaluation is recommended for all the projects with a long term of implementation or those at critical stage of implementation. This Mid Term Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Turkmenistan as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Turkmenistan Country Office and UNDP/GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the *“Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Protected Areas System of Turkmenistan”* (PIMS 3961)

### Objective and Scope

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\\_Policy\\_2010.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf) and guidelines for conducting evaluations: [www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905); as well as the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm>

## **2. Objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

The objective of the MTE is to gain an independent deep view of the progress attained. The MTE is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. Such evaluation is expected to serve as a tool to recognize or bridge the gaps in the primary assessment of relevance, effectiveness and cost-efficiency as gained from the monitoring exercise. The mid-term evaluation enables to assess the primary signs of the project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The mid-term evaluation shall be performed by an independent expert unrelated to the project development or implementation.

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

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

### **2.1 Tasks:**

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

The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework (see Annex 3). Many of these indicators relate to the impact/implementation that will be applied in the impact assessment. The success and failure will partially be determined through the monitoring of the relative changes within the baseline conditions developed within one year of the project implementation. Where possible, the indicator species, sensitive to the changes of habitat and pressure increase, will need to be identified and monitored. In case of an identified

shrinkage of the population of rare and endangered species the measures will be undertaken to identify the causes of such shrinkage and the alternative strategies will be developed to ensure the long-term welfare of the populations that will further be incorporated in the overall project site management.

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

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

### ***3. Duties and Responsibilities and Scope of the Evaluation***

The evaluation exercise will embrace the project elements as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **3.1. Progress towards Results**

Changes in development conditions. Address the following questions:

- (i) Do the results achieved by the project lead to improvement of PA representation and coverage?

- (ii) Do the project achievements contribute to the adequate institutional and individual capacity for the management of the PAS?
- (iii) How the project results and current activities support the overall effort to establish Sumbar National Park?

Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the **Syunt-Hasardag reserve** to conditions in similar reserves.

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

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

### **3.2. Adaptive management framework of the project**

#### Monitoring Systems.

- a) Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
  - Do they provide the necessary information?
  - Do they involve key partners?
  - Are they efficient?
  - Are additional tools required?
- b) Reconstruct baseline data if necessary. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise;
- c) Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements. Apply SMART indicators as necessary;
- d) Apply the GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with the baseline values.

#### Risk Management

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

#### Work Planning

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

### Reporting

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

### **3.3. Underlying Factors**

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

### **3.4. UNDP Contribution**

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

### **3.5. Partnership Strategy**

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

### **3.6. Project Finance**

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

## ***4. Deliverables/Products expected from the evaluation***

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

The Mid-term Evaluation Report

The mid-term evaluation report will include:

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

It is expected to start MTE and complete it in a maximum of **22 working days**, until the end of November, 2012.

The draft and final report will be prepared in the format as provided in Annex 1 hereto. The draft report will be presented to UNDP/GEF not later than **10 October 2012**. The final report will be prepared on the basis of the comments to be obtained from the parties related. The deadline for the final report is **20 November 2012**.

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

## **5. Evaluation Approach**

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

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

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

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

- (i) Desk study of all project documentation (see [Annex2](#))
- (ii) Consultations with MNP, and Syunt-Hasardag state reserve
- (iii) Field visits (Ashgabat, and possible visit to project site – Syunt-Hasardag State reserve )
- (iv) Interviews with related parties
  - MNP, its territorial departments and SPA's
  - Local authorities
  - Local communities

## **6. Evaluation team**

The Mid-term Evaluation will be carried out by one international consultant. UNDP will provide guidance, documentation, and support to international consultant.

The international consultant is responsible for the successful completion of the evaluation and finalizing the Mid-term Evaluation report. The consultant is expected to be familiar with the region and have basic knowledge of the project area (such as region's land management practices, socio-economic and legislative context,)

### **6.1 Evaluator's Competencies and Qualities:**

- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
- Well-developed organizational and inter-personal skills;
- Ability to deliver on time.

### **6.2 Evaluator's Required Skills and Experience:**

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recognized expertise in the land use planning and management;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported land management related projects;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience working in Central Asia region;
- Excellent English communication skills, Russian is advantage

### **6.3 Specifically, the international expert will perform the following tasks:**

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

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

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

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

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



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

### **7. Implementation Arrangements**

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

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

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts and the members of the project steering group: UNDP, National Project Coordinator, and representatives of the interested parties.

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 key activities and timeframe are broken down as follows:

| <b>Activity</b>  | <b>Timeframes and responsibilities</b> |
|--|--|
| Desk review  | 3 days – international expert          |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaire, Briefing of evaluation consultants  | 10 days – international expert         |
| Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings, and other types of feedback mechanisms and Debriefing to UNDP about key findings of evaluation | 4 days – international expert          |
| Preparation of final mid-term evaluation report (including comments)   | 5 days – international expert          |

#### Working days:

International expert – 22 working days

**The process should commence no later than 10 October 2012 and be completed on 20 November 2012 the latest.**

### **HOW TO APPLY**

All applications including [P11 form](#), CV, concept methodology, technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the above address in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “International Consultant for Mid-term Evaluation of UNDP/GEF Protected Area Systems project” or by email at following address ONLY: [registry.tm@undp.org](mailto:registry.tm@undp.org) by **18:00, 13 September, 2012**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

## ANNEX 1.

### The Structure of Mid-term Evaluation Report

#### Executive Summary

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

#### Introduction

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

#### The Project and its Development Context

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

#### Findings and Conclusions

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

### Recommendations

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

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

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

### Annexes

- ToR
- Evaluation Program
- The list of people interviewed
- Summary of site visit
- The list of documents reviewed
- The questionnaire used and brief summary of results
- Relevant mid-term tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard)
- Co-financing table
- Evaluation rating tables

## ANNEX 2.

List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

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

| <b>Document</b>              | <b>Description</b>  |
|------------------------------|---|
| Project document             | The Project Document and Revisions  |
| Project reports              | Project Inception Report<br>Annual Progress Reports<br>Mid-term METT, Financial and Capacity scorecards<br>International Consultant Reports |
| Annual Project Report to GEF | Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs)   |
| Minutes                      | Steering group meetings<br>Meetings with experts, team staff etc.   |

## ANNEX 3.

### STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF)

| Project Strategy and purpose  | Objectively verifiable indicators   |  |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   | Indicator   | Baseline   | Target by EOP  | Sources of verification                         | Risks and Assumptions  |
| <b>Objective:</b><br>To create an enabling environment for the establishment of a functional, effective and ecologically coherent system of protected areas | Coverage (ha) of the protected area system  | 1,934,200 ha   | 2,050,000 ha   | National protected area register                | <b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The government commits to an incremental growth in the grant funding allocation to finance the national parks added to the protected area system</li> <li>– Existing protected area skills and competencies are retained in the MNP</li> </ul> <b>Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– National economic priorities shift away from financial support for protected area activities</li> <li>– Other ministries and public agencies do not cooperate to align strategies, plans and projects</li> </ul>  |
|   | Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US\$) for protected area management  | ~US\$2.5m/ annum                                       | >US\$4.0m/ annum                                       | Annual Financial Report of the MNP              |  |
|   | Financial sustainability scorecard for national systems of protected areas  | 31%  | >48%   | Annual Financial Sustainability Scorecard       |  |
|   | Capacity development indicator score for protected area system  | Systemic: 52%<br>Institutional: 44%<br>Individual: 33% | Systemic: 76%<br>Institutional: 72%<br>Individual: 54% | Annual Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard |  |
| <b>Outcome 1:</b><br>Expanded Protected Area System (PAS) to improve PA representation and coverage   | Extent (ha) of additional areas of under-represented habitat types formally incorporated into the system of protected areas<br>Lowland deserts and desert plateaus<br>Mountains | 22,185ha<br>127,815ha                                  | >24,000ha<br>>175,000ha                                | Annual Report of the MNP<br>NIDFF inventory     | <b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Areas proposed for PA expansion retain some biodiversity or heritage conservation potential</li> <li>– The Law on State Protected Areas, and other complementary legislation, provides the enabling regulatory framework for the establishment of national parks</li> </ul> <b>Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Some areas proposed for expansion become so degraded that they no longer make a contribution to national biodiversity conservation targets</li> <li>– Irreconcilable conflicts arise during the national park feasibility and establishment processes</li> </ul> |
|   | Extent (ha) of formally proclaimed IUCN Category II National Park   | 0ha  | >100,000 ha  | National Protected Area register                |  |
|   | Number of individual protected areas consolidated into, and under the rationalised management of, National Parks  | 0  | >12  | National Protected Area register                |  |
| <b>Outcome 2:</b><br>Adequate institutional and individual capacity is in place for the management of the PAS   | Percentage of income from other sources (i.e. excluding state budget allocation) that finances the recurrent expenditure costs of national parks                                | <5   | >10%   | Annual Report of the MNP                        | <b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Any institutional restructuring processes required for national parks are actively supported by the Government of Turkmenistan</li> <li>– The MNP maintains a clear mandate and unequivocal authority to fulfil oversight and management obligations for the protected area system</li> </ul>   |

| Project Strategy and purpose | Objectively verifiable indicators   |   |               |                          |  |
|------------------------------|---|---|---------------|--------------------------|--|
|                              | Indicator   | Baseline  | Target by EOP | Sources of verification  | Risks and Assumptions  |
|                              | Number of IUCN Category I and II protected areas exceeding a METT score of 35   | Territories:<br>Repetek: 29%<br>Badkhez: 29%<br>Kopetdag: 30%<br>Syunt Khasardag: 29%<br>Kaplankyr: 30%<br>Amadurya: 31%<br>Koyetendag: 30% | >40%          | METT Annual Review       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder institutions constructively engage in the identification of the most cost-effective institutional and financing arrangements for national parks</li> </ul> <b>Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders cannot agree on the preferred cooperative governance and institutional arrangements for national parks</li> <li>Staff completing training and skills development programs are not retained by PA institutions</li> <li>Resistance to the introduction of new financing mechanisms for national parks reduces their financial sustainability</li> </ul> |
|                              | Number of planning support and operational national park staff completing specialised training and/or skills development programs | 0   | >30           | Annual Report of the MNP |  |

#### ANNEX 4.

##### Project ratings table

- a. **Highly satisfactory (HS).** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- b. **Satisfactory (S).** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- c. **Moderately satisfactory (MS).** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- d. **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- e. **Unsatisfactory (U).** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- f. **Highly unsatisfactory (HU).** The project had no M&E system.

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

\* *Status of delivery colouring codes:*

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement

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

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

## ANNEX 5.

### **Co-financing table**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the mid-term evaluation report.

| Co-financing<br>(type/source) | UNDP own financing<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Government<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Partner Agency<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Total<br>(mill. US\$) |        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
|                               | Planned                            | Actual | Planned                    | Actual | Planned                        | Actual | Actual                | Actual |
| Grants                        | 0.06                               | 0.06   |                            |        |                                |        | 0.06                  | 0.06   |
| Loans/Concessions             |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| In-kind support               |                                    |        | 0.59                       | 0.59   |                                |        | 0.59                  | 0.59   |
| • Other                       |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| Totals                        | 0.06                               | 0.06   | 0.59                       | 0.59   |                                |        | 0.65                  | 0.65   |