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# ANNEX I Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation of the Project

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME****JOB DESCRIPTION** |

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Position Information** |
| **Position Title:** **Project Title/Department:** **Type of assignment:****Location:****Duration of assignment:****Reports To:** | International Team Leader for Final Evaluation of the projectUNDP-GEF Project “Strengthening National Capacity in Rio Convention Implementation through Targeted Institutional Strengthening and Professional Development (Rio Conventions Project)” SSA contract, part-timeHome-based work with one mission to Tashkent, Uzbekistan16 working days in September-October 2011 Environment and Energy Unit, UNDP in Uzbekistan |

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Background**  |
| Uzbekistan has acceded to a number of international environmental agreements, including Rio Conventions on climate change, biodiversity and combating desertification which set specific requirements that should be met by the ratifying countries. National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) process in Uzbekistan conducted in 2004-2006 examined and identified the level of existing national capacity and priority capacity development needs related to the implementation of country’s global environmental commitments. The NCSA and the preparatory analysis have demonstrated that deficiencies in environmental management planning and management processes as well as in environmental professional education indeed exist and should be regarded as priorities for Uzbekistan. These deficiencies cause constant omission of environmental concerns, while composing national development plans, and must thus be addressed immediately.Based on the findings of the NCSA and subsequent discussions with key stakeholders the current project is aimed at assisting Uzbekistan to improve its national environment governance system, by creating adequate national capacity to accommodate global environmental concerns into the national development and environmental management plans. Hence, the project’s goal and objective are formulated as follows:**Goal:** To effectively mainstream global environmental priorities into national development planning and management processes of Uzbekistan.**Objective:** To build national capacity for more effective environmental management inUzbekistan, by improved national environmental policy planning and financing.The project plans to attain its objective through the accomplishment of two major outcomes: **Outcome 1:** Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives.**Outcome 2:** Improved financial management capacity of the National Environmental Fund for increased global environmental financing.The project is funded by Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). It started in May 2009 and will end in December 2011. In accordance with UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures all projects of this magnitude supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. The M&E Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives to: a) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; b) to provide a basis for decision-making on necessary amendments and improvements; c) to promote accountability for resource use; d) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. This final evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project/ It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects.This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP CO in Uzbekistan as the Implementing Agency for the Rio Project. UNDP-GEF is primarily interested in analysis of how successful implementation of the project has been, what impacts it has generated, if the project benefits will be sustainable in the long-term and what the lessons learnt are for future interventions in the country, region and other parts of the globe where UNDP-GEF provides its assistance. |

|  |
| --- |
| **III. Functions / Key Outputs Expected**  |
| **PART 1. OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION**This evaluation is expected to provide professional assessment of the project implementation successfulness against the set objectives and indicators, including contribution of the project to achieving global environmental benefits. The evaluation will also collate and analyze lessons learnt and best practices obtained during the period of the project implementation that can be further taken into consideration during development and implementation of other GEF projects in Uzbekistan and elsewhere in the world.The evaluation will in particular assess: 1. Project Design – review the original project intervention strategy including objectives, outcomes, outputs, and activities, and assess the quality of the design and delivery of planned outcomes. The review should also assess the conceptualization, design, effectiveness, relevance, and implementation feasibility of the project. The review should include the updated logical framework matrix that was undertaken during early project inception.
2. Project Impact – assess the achievements of the Rio project to date against the original objectives, outcomes and activities using the indicators as defined in the project document. The indicators that were identified during the project inception should be also used as benchmark to measure the impacts of Rio. In addition to the logical framework in the signed project document, the independent evaluation expert will use the Capacity Development Scorecard and its 15 indicators to assess capacity outcomes, per the Monitoring Guidelines of Capacity Development in Global Environment Facility Projects (2010).
3. Project Implementation – assess:
4. Project management arrangements, i.e., effectiveness of UNDP/GEF, UNDP Country Office and the Project Management Unit (Rio Conventions PMU);
5. Quality and timeliness of delivering outputs and activities;
6. Financial situation (i.e., budget and expenditure status)[[1]](#footnote-1), in particular cost-effectiveness
7. Cooperation among partners including but not limited to: UNDP, State Committee for Nature Protection, Center for Hydro meteorological service, Ministry of Agriculture and water resources, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance,
8. Responsiveness of project management to adapt and implement changes in project execution, based on partner and stakeholder feedback.

Based on the above points, the evaluation should provide a document of approximately 50 pages indicating what project activities, outputs/outcomes and impacts have been achieved to date, and specifically:(1) Assess the extent of the progress that the Rio Conventions Project has made to achieve its objectives and where gaps are evident;(2) Draw lessons from the experiences of the Rio Conventions Project, in particular those elements that have worked well and those that have not, requiring adjustments and;(3) Provide recommendations to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, implementation, execution and sustainability of the Rio Conventions Project.**PART 2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION:**While the specific issues of concern are listed in the following paragraphs, a reference to the UNDP programming manual and UNDP/GEF guidelines to conduct terminal or end-of-cycle evaluations should be made for addressing the issues not covered below. The evaluation will include ratings on the following aspects:1. Outcome and achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project’s immediate and development objectives were achieved);
2. Sustainability of the aforementioned outcomes;
3. Implementation Approach;
4. Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; and
5. Monitoring and Evaluation.

The evaluation will use the following ratings: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory.The evaluation will also assess the project's achievements and outcomes according to the type of capacities developed, i.e., individual, organizational, and systemic.1. Project Conceptualization/Design:
2. Whether the problem the project addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived;
3. Whether the target beneficiaries and end-users of the results of the project are clearly identified;
4. Whether the objectives and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with observable success indicators;
5. Whether the relationship between objectives, outputs, activities and inputs of the project are logically articulated and;
6. Whether the project started with a well-prepared work-plan and reasons, if any, for deviations.

b) Project Relevance:1. Whether the project remains relevant to the development priorities of the country and;
2. Given the objectives of the project, the extent to which appropriate institutions have been assisted.

c) Project Implementation:The evaluation team will examine the quality and timeliness of project implementation:1. The delivery of inputs specified in the project document, including institutional arrangements, interest of beneficiaries, the scheduling and actual implementation;
2. The fulfilling of the success criteria as outlined in the project document;
3. The responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (either facilitating or impeding project implementation). This refers to the project's adaptive collaborative management;
4. Lessons from other relevant projects that were incorporated in the project implementation.
5. The monitoring and backstopping of the project as expected by the Government and UNDP;
6. The delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of financing, personnel, premises and indigenous equipment and;
7. Collaboration with industry associations, private sector and civil society.

d) Project Performance:1. Whether the management arrangements of the project were appropriate;
2. Whether the project resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality;
3. Whether the project resources are used effectively to produce planned results;
4. Whether the project is cost-effective compared to similar interventions;
5. Whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable;
6. The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on the functioning of the project.

e) Results/Success of the Project applied to each Specific Project (3 Areas):The overall outputs and their meaning are as defined in the Project support documents and project documents that should form the main basis for this evaluation. In addition to the mid-term targets in the logical framework, the details of the specific project impact to be provided are: 1. What are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its objectives.
2. What are the potential areas for project’s success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.
3. What major issues and problems affected the implementation of the project and what factors could have resolved them? To what extent was project management effectively adaptive and collaborative?
4. Given an opportunity, what actions the evaluation team members would have recommended to ensure that this potential for success translated into actual success?
5. Level of institutional networking achieved and capacity development of key partners, if done in a structured manner at different stages – from inception to project operations.
6. Social impacts, including impact on the lives of women.
7. Any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced project outcomes.

A table should be included in which progress against the project objectives and each outcome should be discussed and rated on the six-point UNDP scale (Highly Satisfactory HS, Satisfactory S, Marginally Satisfactory MS, Marginally Unsatisfactory MU, Unsatisfactory U, and Highly Unsatisfactory HU.**PART 3. EVALUATION TEAM**A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.The evaluation team will be composed of one International Team Leader and one National Consultant. The evaluators shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former cooperation with GEF is an advantage. The International Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Specifically, the International Team Leader will perform the following tasks:* Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Assist Rio Project Management Unit in drafting terms of reference of additional consultant(s);
* Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
* 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.

The National consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the International Team Leader with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the National Consultant will perform tasks with a focus on:* Review documents;
* Prepare a list of the outputs achieved under project;
* Organize the mission program and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
* Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
* 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;
* Assist International Team Leader in finalizing the evaluation report through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

 Evaluation will be undertaken in line with GEF principles[[2]](#footnote-2)* Independence
* Impartiality
* Transparency
* Disclosure
* Ethical
* Partnership
* Competencies and Capacities
* Credibility
* Utility

**PART 4. METHODOLOGICAL AND EVALUATION APPROACH, CONSULTATIONS, REPORTING**The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. The evaluation team should provide details in respect of:1. Documentation review (desk study);
2. Interviews and/or consultations;
3. Field visits if any;
4. Questionnaires, if used; and
5. Participation of stakeholders and/or partners.

The evaluation team is open to consult all reports, files, manuals, guidelines and resource people he/she feels are essential to the work at hand. The mission will maintain close liaison and consult with the UNDP Resident Representative and Deputy Resident Representative in Uzbekistan, as well as other concerned officials and agencies in UNDP; the Project Board, the State Committee for Nature Protection of Uzbekistan, among other key stakeholder organization and their representatives.The evaluation team will report directly to the Senior Management of UNDP Uzbekistan, UNDP/GEF RCU, but mostly to the UNDP Resident Representative or the designated officials to act on their behalf. The evaluation team shall work in close collaboration with the Rio PMU. The evaluation team will prepare and submit the draft report of the final evaluation to UNDP. A presentation and debriefing of the report to UNDP and the project beneficiaries (State Committee for Nature Protection) and the Project Board will be made as part of the combined wrap-up workshop for the Rio Conventions Project Final Evaluation. The reporting schedule will be finalized during the inception meeting between the consultant and key stakeholders. *Although the team is free to discuss with the authorities on anything relevant to the assignment, under the terms of reference, the team is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP or the Government of Uzbekistan.***PART 5. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION**The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English. The evaluation report should at least, include the following contents:**Executive Summary*** Brief description of project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

**Introduction*** Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation

**The project and its development context*** Project start and its duration
* Problems that the project seeks to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Outcomes/ Results expected

**Findings and Conclusions*** Project formulation
* Implementation approach
* Country ownership
* Stakeholder participation
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions
* Management arrangements

**Implementation*** Financial planning
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Management by the UNDP country office in Uzbekistan
* Coordination and operational issues

**Results*** Attainment of objectives, outcomes and outputs
* Institutional Sustainability
* Contribution to capacity building/development, sub-regional and national development

**Recommendations*** Actions to be taken in order to fill gaps in project implementation and ensure sustainability of project outcomes

**Lessons Learned*** Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success of the project.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **IV. Deliverables and timeframe** |
| The following deliverables and indicative schedule are expected from the consultancy contract. The evaluation will be completed in the period of 16 working days during September-October 2011. The final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of consultancy assignment. All deliverables should be submitted for approval to UNDP Uzbekistan by the Evaluation team in English.Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for aments to government counterparts, project team and UNDP Uzbekistan and UNDP/GEF Bratislava. If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.The activity and timeframe are broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Timeframe and responsible party |
| Desk review | **3 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant** |
| Briefings for evaluators | ½ day by the Rio Project Management Unit/UNDP |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings | **5 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant** |
| Preparation of the first draft report | **4 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant** |
| Review of preliminary findings with project stakeholders through circulation of the draft report for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms | 14 days Rio Conventions PMU, UNDP Uzbekistan and Government counterparts |
| Incorporation of comments from project stakeholders and submission of second draft report | **2 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant** |
| Review and preparation of comments to second draft report | 14 days Rio Conventions PMU, UNDP Uzbekistan and Government counterparts |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on second draft)  | **2 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant** |

Working days:Team Leader – 16 working daysNational Consultant – 16 working days |
| # | ***Deliverables*** | ***Timeframe*** |
| 1 | Prepared first draft report of the Final Evaluation of Rio Conventions Project implementation | 26 September 2011 |
| 2 | Prepared second draft report of the Final Evaluation of Rio Conventions Project implementation | 10 October 2011 |
| 3 | Prepared final report of the Final Evaluation of Rio Project implementation | 24 October 2011 |

|  |
| --- |
| **V. Payment Conditions** |
| This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and travel costs required to produce the abovementioned deliverables. One mission to Tashkent for a total of 5 working days is envisaged:Payment will be released in two installments: 1st installment comprising 50% of total remuneration will be paid upon completion of deliverables # 1 and # 2, their submission and acceptance by UNDP Uzbekistan, 2nd installment of remaining 50% will be paid upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable # 3, its submission and acceptance by UNDP Uzbekistan.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **VI. Recruitment Qualifications** |
| Education: | * Advanced university degree or higher in Environmental Economics, Natural Sciences, Management, Public Administration, Economics or other related fields.
 |
| Experience: | * Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience with 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 result-based evaluation policies and procedures;
* Competency in Adaptive Management, as applied to capacity development, natural resource management, environmental planning and national development projects;
* Recognized expertise in the cross-cutting area of environmental protection and environmental planning and management;
* Familiarity with environmental planning and management policies in Uzbekistan is an asset;
* Work experience in relevant areas (national and regional development planning, environmental management and planning) for at least 5 years,
* Good analytical skills
* Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported capacity development projects;
* Project evaluation experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.
 |
| Language Requirements: | * Fluency in English; knowledge of Russian is an advantage.
 |
| Others: | * Excellent oral and written communication skills
* Good interpersonal and facilitation skills; ability to be flexible, respectful, and effective while working with others from diverse backgrounds
* Ability to meet strict deadlines and work under stressful conditions
 |

Mr. Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov, Head of EE Unit \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

#

# ANNEX II Final Project Report, Project Manager  *DRAFT 2.December 2011 (amended January 2012)*

The UNDP-GEF project “Strengthening National Capacity in Rio Convention Implementation through Targeted Institutional Strengthening and Professional Development” – (*Rio Project*)

**National Implementing Agency:** State Committee for Nature Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan

**National Project Coordinator**: Mr. Nariman Umarov, Chairman of SCNP

**Project manager**: Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov

**Duration**: May, 2009 – December 2011

**Budget:** US$ 475,000 (GEF)

 US$ 5,000 (UNDP TRAC)

 US$ 85,000 (In-kind contribution, UNDP, Uzbekistan)

 US$ 80,000 (In-kind contribution, Government of Uzbekistan)

**Objective**: Uzbekistan has acceded to a number of international environmental agreements, including Rio Conventions on climate change, biodiversity and combating desertification which set specific requirements that should be met by the ratifying countries. This project is a follow-up initiative, based on the results of the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) process in Uzbekistan initiated and conducted in 2004-2006. The idea and objective of the NCSA was to examine and identify the level of existing national capacity and priority capacity development needs related to the implementation of the country’s global environmental commitments. The current project is aimed at assisting Uzbekistan to improve its national environment governance system, by creating adequate national capacity to accommodate global environmental concerns into the national development and environmental management plans. Worth to point out the unique nature of the project since it is focused on enhancing cross-cutting capacity building of the government institutions involved into national environment planning and management.

The current project is a follow up initiative towards practical implementation of key findings identified during the NSCA process in Uzbekistan.

The project is supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in Uzbekistan. It is implemented by the State Committee for Nature Protection (SCNP) of Uzbekistan – National Executing Agency, in partnership with the Center for Hydro meteorological service under the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan and other interested agencies including the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance, State Committee on Land resources, Surveying, Cartography, and State Cadastre, State Committee for Geology and Mineral Resources as well as the Academy for State and Social Construction under the President of Uzbekistan.

Although the project had to be launched in October 2008 the project document has been signed in May 2009. Delay in project commencement was due to late appointment of National Executing Agency by the Government of Uzbekistan. Despite the efforts of UNDP, this process took several months. The Government had to carefully consider internally the roles of different agencies in deciding the agency best suited for the execution of the project. Therefore the actual date of the commencement of project implementation is 06 May 2009. In accordance with the Project Board’s approval during the last meeting on 19 November 2010 the project duration has been extended until 31 December 2011.

***Goal***

*To effectively mainstream global environmental priorities into national development planning and management processes of Uzbekistan*

***Objective***

*To build national capacity for more effective environmental management in Uzbekistan, by improved national environmental policy planning and implementation.*

***Outcome 1****: Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives.*

***Output 1.1****: A new mechanism for coordinated environmental planning and management is introduced for SPEP and programming from environmental funds.*

***Output 1.2****: Professional capacity of the environmental institutions to develop, formulate and evaluate effectiveness of the environmental programmes and environmental plans improved.*

***Outcome 2****: Improved financial management capacity of the National Environmental Fund for increased global environmental financing.*

***Output 2.1****: Fund management tools introduced for improved operations of the EF.*

***Output 2.2****: Skills and knowledge of the EF personnel improved to effectively manage EF.*

**Project Implementation**

**Outcome 1**

The outcome aims to strengthen cooperation and coordination capacities of the stakeholders involved in the process of environmental planning and management. This will be achieved through establishing a mechanism that will enable individuals and institutions that manage and evaluate the environmental planning processes (i.e. State Program for Environmental Protection) to effectively incorporate the priorities of the Rio Conventions in the planning and programming cycles.

***Output 1.1****: A new mechanism for coordinated environmental planning and management is introduced for SPEP and programming from environmental funds.*

In general the following main results have been achieved within the implementation of this Output:

***Year 2009***

During 2009 the project was involved in the process of establishing partnerships and skills to create the foundation for the successful implementation of the project.

The Project Inception workshop was conducted on 20 November 2009 and attended by more than 60 participants including representatives of all stakeholders, partner agencies, international organizations, environmental NGOs and etc.

Based on Inception Workshop outcomes the project prepared Inception Report approved by the Project Board during its 1st meeting held on 17 March 2010. During the meeting the PB members also approved the Statute on Project Board as well as AWP for 2010.

***Years 2010-2011***

1. Policy assessment report on current shortcomings in integrating commitments contained in Rio Conventions into the national policy including recommendations on introducing modifications into the State Program on Environment Protection (SPEP) development process has been prepared by a group of local consultants. The document has been discussed with representatives of project stakeholders (25 participants) during the Round Table held on 15 September 2010.

2. A package of recommendations to the Government of Uzbekistan to improve the environment governance system including application of modern planning methods and tools based on good international practice as well as formulation and implementation of a 5 year State Program for Nature Protection (SPEP) of Uzbekistan for better accomplishment of global environmental objectives and addressing needs of stakeholders has been prepared.

3. A modified set of procedures and rules for SPEP formulation and implementation including recommendations on better harmonization of SPEP programming and Environmental Fund resource distribution has been developed.

4. A set of new performance indicators illustrating the progress of Uzbekistan in Rio Convention implementation has been developed by a group of local consultants. The relevant working paper was discussed by key project stakeholders during the interim meetings held in August-September 2010. In addition a Practical Manual on application of developed indicators is in process of finalization.

***Output 1.2****: Professional capacity of the environmental institutions to develop, formulate and evaluate effectiveness of the environmental programmes and environmental plans improved.*

This output aims at capacity building of professionals and decision makers from key stakeholder agencies on the development, formulation and efficiency assessment of programs and action plans on nature protections area as well as promotion of knowledge level and awareness of the government officials on Global Environmental issues, defined in Rio Conventions.

The following main results have been achieved within the implementation of this Output:

1. Policy recommendations on using modern planning tools and Practical Manual for practitioners from various environmental agencies have been developed by a project international consultant.

2. A pilot training course on “Environmental issues and Leader’s responsibility” has been developed for the Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of Uzbekistan. It has been approved by the Academy's Scientific Council. The Urgench State University integrated selected topics from the pilot training program into the curricula of its Master's Course.

In addition the following working meetings, round tables and workshops have been conducted:

***31 March – 1 April 2010***, a Pilot training workshop on Rio Conventions for 56 trainees of the Academy for State and Social Construction.

***22-22 May 2010***, Induction training on Rio Conventions for 20 decision makers and practitioners from relevant environmental and other agencies involved into the environmental planning and policy making process.

***28 July 2010***, a Practical training for 40 specialists and experts from interested governmental agencies, institutions and state owned companies to improve their practical skills on identification and preparation of project proposals to be financed within the fifth cycle of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-5).

***29-30 October 2010***, a Practical training workshop in Urgench city, Khorezm region, for 60 trainees of the Academy for State and Social Construction on environmental and economic restructuring of land and water usage for sustainable development within the probation of pilot training program on “Environmental Management” developed for ASSC.

***5-6 March 2011***, A working meeting to discuss global and national environmental priorities and their better integration into the proposed Welfare Improvement Strategy of Uzbekistan for 2011-2014 was organized jointly with the project of ADB and the Government of Uzbekistan “Development of the Welfare Improvement Strategy of Uzbekistan for 2011-2014” for 25 participants including members of selected WIS II thematic groups and representatives from various environmental and other agencies.

***27 May 2011****,*One-day training workshop on environmental issues and practical methods of legislative documents’ environmental assessment was conducted for 80 members of Legislative Chamber of Uzbek Parliament jointly with UNDP-GEF-GIZ project on “Multi-country Capacity Building Project of Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management” and UNDP project on “Parliamentary Development Assistance”.

***8 June 2011***, a Round table was organized for more than 30 representatives of Higher Educational Institutions to present a pilot training module on “Environmental issues and Leader’s responsibility” developed for the Academy of State and Social Construction and to discuss possible ways of its integration into the curriculum of higher education institutions of Uzbekistan.

***16 June 2010***, a Special workshop on implementation of modern planning tools delivered by International consultant for targeted group of practitioners and experts, involved into the economic and environmental planning process in Uzbekistan

**27 June – 3 July 2011**, a study tour to the Czech Republic on “Capacity Building of Uzbek Experts on Strategic Environmental Assessment” for a group of specialists from relevant stakeholder and other interested agencies in cooperation with UNDP Czech Trust Fund.

***26 August 2011***, a Working meeting was organized for 25 decision makers and practitioners from interested agencies to discuss the issues and recommendations on modification of procedures towards formulation and implementation of a five year State Program on Environment Protection (SPEP) for better integration of global and national environmental priorities into the national planning system.

***8 September 2011***. One day workshop on Strategic Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment at regional level was conducted for the Heads of Regional Committees for Nature Protection and senior management of key Departments of the State Committee for Nature Protection of Uzbekistan.

***9-12 November 2011,*** *a* workshop to “Strengthen capacity for the development of EIA and SEA systems in Uzbekistan, with sharing of experiences from other countries in the implementation of the Espoo Convention and in particular its Protocol on SEA” was conducted for more than 25 participants in cooperation with UNECE.

In total 8 training workshops as well as 4 Round table and analytical discussions on Rio Conventions implementation and policy integration were held, involving 487 participants, including 144 women. In addition, a study tour to the Czech Republic on capacity building of Uzbek specialists on Strategic Environmental Assessment was conducted for 10 experts from various interested agencies.

**Outcome 2**

The activities under this outcome are targeted at development and implementation of new approaches on financial management of Environmental Funds, operating in Uzbekistan both at national and regional levels, as well as to develop solid operational and personnel capacities to ensure effective financing of environmental programmes and projects.

***Output 2.1****: Fund management tools introduced for improved operations of the EF.*

In general the following main results have been achieved within the implementation of this Output:

**Years 2010-2011**

1. Several reports on existing operational management and project cycle management of the Republican and Regional Funds for Nature Protection as well as report on current financing market with focus on investment opportunities related to Rio Conventions have been prepared by local consultants respectively.

2. Review of good international practice in the area of Environmental fund management in selected counties of CEE including Czech Republic, Poland and Croatia was prepared, presented and submitted to Uzbek EF Management and project stakeholders by international consultant.

3. Six Strategy papers on upgrading EF operations in the following fund management areas: a) Governance, b) Capitalization, c) Project cycle management, d) Spending strategies, e) Procurement, and f) Promotion were completed, presented and submitted to Uzbek EF Management and project stakeholders by international consultant.

4. A new operational procedures for the Republican and Regional Funds for Nature Protection of Uzbekistan including amendments into Fund's Regulations as well as introduction of a new project cycle management system have been proposed. In addition a new electronic information and database system for EF operations has been developed.

***Output 2.2****: Skills and knowledge of the EF personnel improved to effectively manage EF.*

The following training activities have been conducted for EF staff to strengthen their skills on effective EF operational management:

***1 -2 July 2010***, a Special training workshop on Rio Conventions and environmental financing mechanisms for more than 40 participants including Uzbek EF staff

***14-15 October 2010***, a Special training workshop for 30 Uzbek EF staff on presentation of recommendations and new approaches elaborated by international consultant towards upgrading the performance of the National Environmental Fund

***27 November - 5 December 2010***, Study tour for selected Uzbek EF staff to the Republic of Croatia to learn the experience of Croatian specialist in the area of environmental financing including activities and operational management of the Croatian Fund for Environment Protection and Energy Efficiency.

***15-16 September 2011***. Two day training workshop on presentation of new operational management of the Fund including presentation of Amendments into Fund’s Statute, introduction of new project cycle management and electronic information and data base systems was organized for 30 practitioners from the Republican and Regional Funds for Nature Protection as well as Regional Departments of Economy and environmental management of SCNP.

***4 November 2011***. A workshop on practical application of a new electronic information and database system developed by the project was conducted in Bukhara city for 21 EF staff from 7 neighboring Regional Funds for Nature Protection.

***18 November 2011***. A workshop on practical application of a new electronic information and database system developed by the project was conducted in Fergana city for 21 EF staff from 7 neighboring Regional Funds for Nature Protection.

In total 5 training workshops have been conducted for more than 190 participants including EF staff and experts involved into EF activities including 42 female and 148 male participants. In addition a study tour to the Republic of Croatia to learn activities and operational management of the Croatian Fund for Environment Protection and Energy Efficiency was conducted for 6 Uzbek EF staff.

**Outcome 3**

**Project Management**

1. The project web page was developed and launched within the official web site of the State Committee for Nature Protection of Uzbekistan

2. Good practices and lessons learned are in the process of packaging into knowledge products and they will easily accessible and are accessed by relevant stakeholders and general public.

**Issues and challenges faced**

1. The lack of local expertise in certain areas caused a problem with the recruitment of experts and timely accomplishment of planned activities in the area of environmental planning methodology. The project team tried to widely disseminate information on vacancies attracting more applicants for announced positions and ensured that suitable experts could be eventually be mobilized. Due to lack of local expertise in the area of environmental planning methodology the project team requested PB and further UNDP/GEF to recruit international expert in this area.

2. Since the project implementation was commenced with delay for 7 months in order to successfully undertake project activities and deliver outputs at a required quality level, the project team requested PB and UNDP/GEF and has been granted no-cost extension of project duration until 31 December 2011.

**Lessons learned and follow up steps**

1. Despite of project’s complexity, multi-focal area and cross-cutting capacity building nature the project team was able to establish good partnerships and skills among all involved stakeholders and interested parties to create the foundation for the successful implementation of the project. The ad hoc thematic working groups established within respective project Components allowed to involve representatives of key stakeholders into the project activities and helped to guide the implementation, build consensus, share decisions and validate findings/results.

2. Active involvement of all project stakeholders including the Center for Hydro meteorological service under the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan into the implementation of project activities demonstrated their strong commitment to contribute to successful achievement of project objectives and targets.

3. Project’s partnerships and activities conducted in close cooperation with the Parliament of Uzbekistan, the Academy for State and Social Construction under the President of Uzbekistan, the Working group on development of the Welfare Improvement Strategy of Uzbekistan for 2011-2014 significantly contributed to awareness rising of decision makers about global environmental priorities and indicated the Government’s commitment to integrate environmental considerations into the national legislation and policy planning process.

4. Intensive dialogue with the SCNP and RFNP ensured that a high degree of solutions and recommendations elaborated by the project including amendments to EFs Statute for improving their capitalization and spending strategies, introduction of new project cycle management system with new selection criteria based on global and national environmental priorities including Rio Conventions as well as development of electronic information and database system have been accepted by the SCNP and EF management.

5. Due to high employee turnover and shortage of young specialists within various stakeholder agencies the project team faced difficulties with attracting relevant specialists to the training activities organized by the project. In this regard future projects involved into multi-focal area and cross-sectoral capacity development are recommended to have an expert on training activities within project’s core staff who would closely work with targeted group of trainees from interested agencies in order to ensure that interested experts are involved and relevant knowledge management and knowledge transfer mechanisms are in place.

6. In the course of project implementation the project team found out shortcomings in knowledge transfer among the experienced and young experts within various stakeholder agencies. Additionally, most of the training activities were attended by the same limited number of experts. In this regard the project team learned the importance of establishing and institutionalizing effective mechanisms of knowledge transfer within particular agency. In addition to tracking how successfully the training participants were able to use the knowledge derived from these trainings into their work, the project team should conduct surveys on how the knowledge obtained was transferred to other colleagues.

7. Taking into account the importance and significance of study tours organized to the Czech Republic and Croatia during the project implementation in terms of getting knowledge and sharing the experience with colleagues in the areas concerned the project should introduce more competitive procedures for selection of candidates to the mentioned activities in order to better motivate them for obtaining knowledge and improving their professional skills. Such competitions should be organized within conducted relevant workshops or in the form of interviews.

**Follow up steps**

**Output 1.1**

1. The State Committee for Nature Protection is required to submit to the Government of Uzbekistan the Concept Paper on elaboration of the new 5 year State Program on Environment Protection (SPEP) and establishment of a permanent Working Group (WG) aimed at formulation of the new SPEP program, its further implementation and monitoring to ensure better coordination and wide participation of all interested parities

2. Key project stakeholders leading by the State Committee for Nature Protection and involved into the national environmental policy formulation and implementation process including a 5 year SPEP of Uzbekistan are required to follow up with recommendations developed by the project towards further improvement of environment policy planning process though application of modern planning methods and tools for better accomplishment of global and national environmental priorities as well as addressing needs of stakeholders

3. The State Committee for Nature Protection and Uzhydromet responsible for implementation of Rio Conventions are recommended to further develop institutional and human resource capacities of their respective agencies though strengthening “institutional memory”, effective generation, sharing and dissemination of relevant information related to Rio Conventions implementation among interested parties

4. The State Committee for Nature Protection and Uzhydromet should continue the work on further development of performance and impact indicators illustrating the progress in Rio Convention implementation towards their practical application in the planning process and preparation of relevant National Communications and Reports to respective Conventions.

**Output 1.2**

1. Key project stakeholders leading by the State Committee for Nature Protection are recommended to enhance the capacities and professional skills of their staff though organization of training activities based on training materials, practical guidelines and manuals for practitioners developed by the project.

2. Key project stakeholders are recommended to further strengthen and develop effective knowledge management and knowledge transfer mechanisms within their respective agencies though introduction of mandatory courses, regular training and retraining programs for the staff, special workshops upon completion of study tours, business trips and etc.

3. Key project stakeholders leading by the State Committee for Nature Protection are recommended to further strengthen partnerships with the Academy for State and Social Construction under President of Uzbekistan in conducting relevant short-courses for practitioners from interested environmental agencies as well providing support to run a pilot training course on “Environmental issues and Leader’s responsibility”.

4. The Academy for State and Social Construction is recommended to integrate the pilot training module on “Environmental issues and Leader’s responsibility” into the curricula of all faculties and maintain partnership with interested environmental agencies to involve relevant experts as a guest lecturers. The ASSC needs to further develop the Resource center (lab) for compilation all relevant information and knowledge materials in the area of environment protection.

**Output 2.1**

1. The State Committee for Nature Protection (SCNP) and the Republican Fund for Nature Protection (RFNP) are requested to submit to the Government of Uzbekistan the draft resolution related to introduction of new operational procedures for the Funds for Nature Protection including amendments to the Fund’s Regulations and introduction of new Project Cycle Management system.

2. The SCNP and RFNP Management are requested to further strengthen operational capacities of the Funds for Nature Protection through gradual adoption of recommendations developed by the project and related to the following management areas including governance, capitalization, spending strategies, promotion and etc.

3. The SCNP is recommended to continue with introduction of a new project management cycle and electronic information and database systems developed by the project and aimed at streamlining Funds’ operations.

4. The SCNP and RFNP Management are requested to actively collaborate and coordinate their activities with stakeholders towards establishing effective fundraising mechanisms and attracting additional resources from international financial institutions, international donors, business community and etc.

5. The RFNP is recommended to actively launch the promotion campaigns towards making its activities more transparent and accessible to potential partners, donors and public. Promotional activities would include development of website, publication of relevant guidelines, information leaflets, reports and etc.

**Output 2.2**

1. The RFNP is recommended to conducted series of training activities for the staff of Funds for Nature Protection towards strengthening their skills in application of a new project management cycle guidelines and electronic information and database systems.

2. The RFNP is recommended to conduct series of meetings and discussions with stakeholders and decisions makers from other government agencies to update on the progress of Fund’s activities and develop proposal on further upgrading its operations.

3. The RFNP is recommended to further strengthen “institutional memory” of the fund and ensure that effective knowledge management and knowledge transfer mechanisms in place.

4. The RFNP is recommended to further strengthen professional skills of the staff in the area of effective fundraising and preparation of proposals for co-funding arrangements and etc.

**Financial management**

2009

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Donor | Approved Budget | Expenditure | Delivery, %  |
| GEFUNDP | 50 1780 | 45 458 0 | 90,6%  |
| Hard component | 6 185  | 6185 | 100 %  |
| Soft component | 43 993 | 39 173  | 89 % |

2010

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Donor | Approved Budget | Expenditure | Delivery, %  |
| GEFUNDP | 186 9000 | 198 154 0 | 106%  |
| Hard component | 0  | 0 | 0 %  |
| Soft component | 186 900 | 198 154  | 106 % |

2011

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Donor | Approved Budget | Expenditure | Delivery, %  |
| GEFUNDP | 231 3875,000 | 231 288 5,000 | 99,96 %  |
| Hard component | 5,000  | 4,873 | 97.5 %  |
| Soft component | 231 387 | 231 288  | 99,96 %  |

Budget Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Donor | Planned | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total | Balance |
| Budget (initial)(as per Inception Report) | GEFUNDP | 475,0000,00 | 50,1780,00 | 186,9000,00 | 237,9220,00 | 475,00 | 0 |
| Budget (revised) | GEFUNDP | 475,000 | 45,4590,00 | 199,212 0,00 | 231,387 5,000 | 480,00 |  |
| Expenditure | GEFUNDP |  | 45,4590,00 | 198,154 0,00 | 231,288 4,873 | 479,774 |  |
| Balance |  |  |  | 1,058 |  226 |  226 |  |

\* The project team requested additional funds from UNDP TRAC in amount of USD 5,000 to procure

IT equipment for supporting the developed electronic information database system for Republican

and Reginonal Funds for Nature Protection

**Synergies with other projects and programs**

UNDP-GEF-GIZ project on “Multi-country Capacity Building Project of Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management”

29-30 October 2010, a Practical training workshop was conducted jointly with UNDP-GEF-GIZ project on “Multi-country Capacity Building Project of Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management”in Urgench city, Khorezm region, for 60 trainees of the Academy for State and Social Construction on environmental and economic restructuring of land and water usage for sustainable development within the probation of pilot training program on “Environmental Management” developed for ASSC.

Project of ADB and the Government of Uzbekistan “Development of the Welfare Improvement Strategy of Uzbekistan for 2011-2014”

5-6 March 2011, A working meeting to discuss global and national environmental priorities and their better integration into the proposed Welfare Improvement Strategy of Uzbekistan for 2011-2014 was organized jointly with the project of ADB and the Government of Uzbekistan “Development of the Welfare Improvement Strategy of Uzbekistan for 2011-2014” and UNDP-GEF-GIZ project on “Multi-country Capacity Building Project of Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management” for 25 participants including members of selected WIS II thematic groups and representatives from various environmental and other agencies.

**The Government of Uzbekistan and UNDP project on “Parliamentary Development Assistance”**

27 May 2011, One-day training workshop on environmental issues and practical methods of legislative documents’ environmental assessment was conducted for 80 members of Legislative Chamber of Uzbek Parliament jointly with UNDP project on “Parliamentary Development Assistance” and UNDP-GEF-GIZ project on “Multi-country Capacity Building Project of Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management” and.

**Resource mobilization**

**UNDP Czech Trust Fund (financing in amount of USD 27, 378)**

27 June – 3 July 2011, a study tour to the Czech Republic on “Capacity Building of Uzbek Experts on Strategic Environmental Assessment” for a group of specialists from relevant stakeholder and other interested agencies in cooperation with UNDP Czech Trust Fund.

**UNECE (financing USD 12,400)**

9-12 November 2011, a workshop to “Strengthen capacity for the development of EIA and SEA systems in Uzbekistan, with sharing of experiences from other countries in the implementation of the Espoo Convention and in particular its Protocol on SEA” was conducted for more than 25 participants in cooperation with UNECE.

**UNDP Croatia (contribution in terms of spent man-hours/days for providing thematic and logistics support)**

27 November - 5 December 2010, Study tour for selected Uzbek EF staff to the Republic of Croatia to learn the experience of Croatian specialist in the area of environmental financing including activities and operational management of the Croatian Fund for Environment Protection and Energy Efficiency.

# ANNEX III People consulted during the Final Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Representative** | **Position Title** | **Agency** |
| Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov | Rio Conventions Project Manager (PM) | Rio Conventions Project team  |
| Ms. Guzal Khodjaeva | Task Manager, Environmental planning & management | Rio Conventions Project team  |
| Mr. Shukhrat Abdullaev | Task Manager, Environmental financing | Rio Conventions Project team  |
| Ms. Nayle Nurmatova  | Administration & Finance Assistant  | Rio Conventions Project team  |
| Mr. Stefan Liller | Assistant Resident Representative (Programme) | UNDP Country Office, Uzbekistan |
| Mr. Abduvakkos Abdurakhmanov | Head of Environment and Energy Unit | UNDP Country Office, Uzbekistan |
| Mr. Nariman Umarov | Chairperson of SCNP | State Committee for Nature Protection (SCNP) |
| Mr. Artur Mustafin | Deputy Chairperson of Tashkent municipal Committee for nature protection | State Committee for Nature Protection (SCNP) |
| Mr. Bakhtiyor Kadyrov | First Deputy General Director | Uzhydromet, Centre for Hydro Meteorological Service under the Cabinet of Ministers  |
| Ms. Raisa Taryannikova | Head of Secretariat, CACILM | Uzhydromet, Centre for Hydro Meteorological Service under the Cabinet of Ministers |
| Mr. Khodjimurat Talipov | Head of the Forest Restoration Department | Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (Forestry department) |
| Mr. Shukhrat Bobomurodov | Head of Division | State Committee on Land resources, Surveying, Cartography and State cadastre of Uzbekistan |
| Ms. Muattara Rakhimova | Head of the International Law Department | Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of Uzbekistan |
| Mr. Bakhriddin Muradov | Chief Expert on ecological issues | Ministry of Economics, Department for agriculture and water resources development |
|  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Team** | **Uzbekistan ‘Rio Conventions’ Project** |  |
| Mr. Peter Hunnam | International Consultant |  |
| Ms. Nodira Mukhammadkulova | National Consultant |  |

# ANNEX IV List of Documents used in Project Final Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Document title** | **Date** | **File name \_ language** | **Author** |
| Project Formulation | Project Development Facility ‘A’ | 2006 07 | 2006 PDFA ТPRR-RioCB\_eng |  |
| Project Document | 2008 11 | 2009 Prodoc\_eng |  |
| LPAC Meeting Minutes | 2009 04 | 2009 LPAC signed\_eng |  |
| Project Document sign page | 2009 05 | 2009 Prodoc Signature page\_eng |  |
| Project Board Statute and Membership | 2009 06 | 2009 PB Statute\_eng |  |
| Project Inception Report | 2010 02 | 2010 Inception Report \_eng |  |
| Project Direction | Project Board Mtg Minutes | 2010 03 | 2010 03 PB Minutes\_ eng |  |
| Project Board Mtg Decisions | 2010 03 | 2010 03 PB Decisions\_eng |  |
| Project Board Mtg Minutes | 2010 11 | 2010 11 PB Minutes\_eng |  |
| Project Board Mtg Minutes | 2011 07 | 2011 07 PB Minutes\_eng |  |
| Project Work Plans | Annual Work Plan | 2009 | 2009 AWP\_A\_eng |  |
| Annual Work Plan | 2009 | 2009 AWP\_B\_eng |  |
| Annual Work Plan | 2010 | 2010 AWP\_C\_eng |  |
| Annual Work Plan | 2010 | 2010 AWP\_D\_eng |  |
| Annual Work Plan | 2010 | 2010 AWP\_E\_eng |  |
| Annual Work Plan | 2011 | 2011 AWP\_F\_eng |  |
| Annual Plan of Action  | 2010 | 2010 APA\_eng (docx and xls) |  |
| Annual Plan of Action | 2011 | 2011 APA\_eng (docx and xls) |  |
| Project Reports | Annual Review Report | 2009 | 2009 ARR\_eng |  |
| Annual Project Review PIR | 2010 | 2010 PIR\_eng |  |
| Annual Progress Reporting | 2010 12 | 2010 APR\_eng |  |
| Annual Project Review PIR  | 2011 09 | 2010 APR\_eng |  |
| Quarterly Project Reporting | 2011 09 | 2010 QPR\_eng |  |
| Final Project Report - draft | 2011 11 | 2011 Final Project Report\_eng | F. Salakhuddinov |
| Project web-site – pages on Project activities | 2011 11 | 2011 Website\_About project\_eng |  |
| F Background | GEF Strategic Approach to enhance capacity building | 2003 | 2003 GEF Strategic Approach to CB GEF/C.22.8 |  |
| Uzbekistan NCSA Report  | 2006 | 2006 Uzbekistan NCSA Report and CAP |  |
| Uzbekistan NCSA Cross-Cutting Report eng | 2006 | NCSA Uzbek Cross-Cutting Report |  |
| UNECE Uzbekistan Environmental Performance Review | 2009 | 2009 UNECE Uzbekistan Environment Performance Review | UNECE |
| Bulgaria CB2 Project, Final Evaluation report  | 2010 | 2010 Hollands Bulgaria CB2 FEV Report |  |
| Kyrgystan CB2 Project, MidTerm Evaluation Report  | 2010 | 2010 Rijal MTE-Kyrgystan |  |
| Armenia CB2 Project, MidTerm Evaluation Report  | 2010 | 2011 Socioscope Armenia \_Report |  |
| Nuratau-Kyzylkum Biosphere Reserve Project, Terminal Evaluation Report  | 2007 | 855 PIMS 1271 Uzbekistan N-K Biosphere Reserve |  |
| Project web-site – page on MEAs | 2011 11 | About Global Conventions Website page |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Technical products – Outcome 1. | 1. Report on assessment of institutional management and mechanisms of coordination in accomplishing Rio Conventions commitments. Improvement of environmental planning and management.
 | 2010 | 2010 General report on env. policy assessment rus | Khamzina T.I.  |
| 1. Minutes and recommendations of the Round table discussion on assessment of the current environmental planning and management policies in Uzbekistan
 | 2010 | 2010 Minutes and recommendations of the Round table | Project staff |
| 1. Report on strengthening 5-year State Program for Nature Protection of Uzbekistan - development of modified procedure and mechanisms of implementation
 | 2011 | 2011 Report on strengthening of SPNP\_rus | Yunusov N.A.  |
|  | 1. Review of modern planning instruments and recommendations on their application into the national environmental planning process of Uzbekistan
 | 2011 | 2011 Review of modern planning instruments and recommendations on their application into the national environmental planning process rus | Borisova  |
|  | 1. Practical Guidelines on application of modern environmental planning instruments for integrating global environmental priorities into national planning system
 | 2011 | 2011 Practical manual on modern plan.instruments\_rus | Borisova O.  |
|  | 1. Report on general set of new indicators illustrating the progress of Uzbekistan in Rio Convention implementation
 | 2010 | 2010Report on set of new indicators\_rus | Agaltseva N.A. |
|  | 1. Methodological manual on application of developed set of performance indicators to illustrate progress of Uzbekistan in implementation of Rio conventions
 | 2011 | 2011 Meth. guideline appl. new set of indicators\_rus | Pak A. |
|  | 1. Training materials for targeted group of practitioners and policy makers aimed at better integration of Rio Convention commitments into national policies
 | 2010-2011 | 2011 Finalized Training material | National consultants |
|  | 1. Training module on “Environmental issues and responsibility of governmental officials” for ASSC
 | 2010 & 2011 | 2010&2011 Training module for ASSC trainees uzb | National consultants |
|  | 1. Report on pilot workshop for 60 ASSC trainees on Rio Conventions
 | 2010 03-04 | 2010 03-04 Rep on Pilot workshop for ASSC\_eng | Project staff |
|  | 1. Report on Induction Training on Rio Conventions
 | 2010 05 | 2010 05 Rep. on Induction Training\_eng | Project staff |
|  | 1. Report on practical workshop for ASSC trainees on environmental and economic restructuring of land and water use for sustainable development
 | 2010 10 | 2010 10 Report on practical workshop for ASSC\_rus | Project staff |
|  | 1. Working meeting Minutes to discuss issues of integration environmental priorities into the proposed Welfare Improvement Strategy, 2011-2014
 | 2011 03 | 2011 Minutes of the Working meeting with group of experts involved into formulation of WIS, 2011-2014 rus  | Project staff |
|  | 1. Report on training-workshop for members of Uzbek Parliament on environmental issues and practical methods of legislative documents’ environmental assessment
 | 2011 05 | 2011 05 Report on Training for Parliament\_rus | Project staff |
|  | 1. Report on training seminar for senior specialists from relevant environmental agencies, on modern environmental planning methods and instruments of
 | 2011 06 | 2011 06 Report on planning instruments workshop\_rus | Project staff |
|  | 1. Report on one-week study tour in Czech Republic on SEA for 10 experts from stakeholder agencies
 | 2011 06-07 | 2011 06-07 Report on study tour Prague\_ eng  | Project staff |
|  | 1. Report on workshop on development of SEA and EIA in Uzbekistan with sharing the experience of countries in implementing Espoo Convention and Protocol on SEA
 | 2011 11 | 2011 11 Rep.on workshop on development of SEA&EIA in Uzbekistan eng  | Project staff |
| Technical Products – Outcome 2 | 1. Overview of Operational and Management Capacities of Republican Fund for Nature Protection
 | 2010 | 2010 Overview of Capacities Uzb Rep Fund for EP\_eng/ru | A. Mustafin |
| 1. Review of Good Practice in Operating Environmental Funds in other countries
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Report International Good Practice in EFs\_eng /ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Strategy Paper #1 Governance
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Strategy Paper #1Governance\_eng/ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Strategy Paper #2 Capitalization
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Strategy Paper #2Capitalization\_eng/ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Strategy Paper #3 Project Cycle Management
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Strategy Paper #3 Project Cycle Management\_eng/ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Strategy Paper #4 Spending Strategies
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Strategy Paper #4 Spending Strategies\_eng/ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Strategy Paper #5 Promotion
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Strategy Paper #5 Promotion\_eng/ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Strategy Paper #6 Procurement
 | 2010 09 | 2010 09 Strategy Paper #6 Procurement \_eng/ru | J. Klarer |
| 1. Assessment of current environmental financing market in Uzbekistan with focus on investment areas of Rio Conventions
 | 2010 | 2010 Assessment of current env.fin.mkt\_eng | B. Malikov,J. Kakharov |
| 1. Review of existing practices of project cycle management within Republican and Regional environmental funds
 | 2010 | 2010 Existing PCM practices review\_ru | G. Amirova |
|  | 1. Report on methodological approaches towards assessment and calculation on environmental damage assessment
 | 2010 | 2010 Report on assessment and calculation on environmental damage assessment rus | S.Akhmedova |
|  | 1. Review of the existing system of electronic document flow, data collection and processing within the EFs
 | 2011 | 2011 Doc flow system review\_rus | Ubaydullaeva |
|  | 1. Recommendations on improvement of the operational management of the Uzbekistan EFs
 | 2011 | 2011 Recommendations on oper.mngt.improvement\_ru | G. Bensitova |
|  | 1. Guidelines on project cycle management within Uzbekistan EFs (full version with loans)
 | 2011 | 2011 Guidelines on PCM\_full version\_ru | K. Norov |
|  | 1. Guidelines on project cycle management within EFs in Uzbekistan (interim version for grant financing)
 | 2011 | 2011 Guidelines on PCM\_interim version\_ru | K. Norov |
|  | 1. Report on special training workshop on Rio Conventions and environmental financing mechanisms
 | 2010 | 2011 11 Report on training materials\_ru | G. Bensitova,U. Akhmedov |
|  | 1. Report on Study tour of EF operations in Republic of Croatia for selected Uzbek specialists
 | 2010 | 010 04 Report-BTOR Study Tour Croatia\_eng | F.Salakhuddinov |
|  | 1. Report on training on new guidelines for project cycle management and recommendations on improvement of operational management of EFs
 | 2011 09 | 2011 09 Training Report\_ru | Sh. Abdullaev |
|  | 1. Report on training on implementation of newly developed information system for EFs (Bukhara city, Nov. 20)
 | 2011 11 | 2011 11 Training Report\_ru | Sh. Abdullaev |
|  | 1. Report on training on implementation of newly developed information system for EFs (Fergana city, Nov. 2011)
 | 2011 11 | 2011 11 Training Report\_ru | Sh. Abdullaev |
|  | 1. Training materials on Rio conventions and financing mechanisms
 | 2010 | 2010 Training materials on RIO conv. and fin. mechanisms\_ru | G. Bensitova,U. Akhmedov |
|  | 1. Training materials on upgrading operational management of EFs and introduction of new project cycle management guidelines
 | 2011 | 2011 09 Training module materials\_ru | Sh. Abdullaev |
|  | 1. User manuals for information system for EFs
 | 2011 | 2011 Infosystem\_user\_manual\_uz; 2011 Instruction on 1E form\_uz\_ru | IQL, software company |

# ANNEX V GEF Projects in Uzbekistan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **GEF Focal Area** | **Project Title** | **Duration** |
| 1 | Biodiversity | National Biodiversity Strategies, Action Plan, and First Report to the CBD | 2005 -  |
| 2 | Climate Change | Country Study on Climate Change | 1997 -  |
| 3 | Ozone Depleting Substances | Programme for Phasing out Ozone Depleting Substances | 1999 -  |
| 4 | Climate Change | Expedited Financing of Climate Change Enabling Activities (Phase II) | 2000 - |
| 5 | Biodiversity | Establishment of the Nuratau-Kyzylkum Biosphere Reserve as a Model for Biodiversity Conservation | 2001 -  |
| 6 | Multi Focal Area | National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management | 2004 – 2006 |
| 7 | Biodiversity | Assessment of Priority National Capacity Development Needs for Implementation of the BSAP and Establishment of CHM Structures | 2004 - |
| 8 | Biodiversity | Conservation of "Tugai Forest" and Strengthening Protected Areas System in the Amu Darya Delta of Karakalpakstan | 2005 -  |
| 9 | Land Degradation | http://www.worldbank.org/wb/images/spacer.gifCACILM Partnership Framework - Land Improvement Project | 2006 -  |
| 10 | Land Degradation | Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the Exposed Aral Seabed and the Kyzylkum Desert, Uzbekistan - CACILM Partnership Framework, Phase 1 | 2007 -  |
| 11 | Biodiversity | Strengthening Sustainability of the National Protected Area System by Focusing on Strictly Protected Areas | 2008 -  |
| 12 | Multi Focal Area | \*Strengthening National Capacity in Rio Convention Implementation through Targeted Institutional Strengthening and Professional Development | 2008 – 2011  |
| 13 | Biodiversity | Mainstreaming biodiversity into Uzbekistan’s oil-and-gas sector policies and operations | 2009 - |
| 14 | Climate Change | Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings | 2009 -  |
| 15 | Multi Focal Area | Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change Mitigation Project | 2011 -  |
| 16 | Land Degradation | Reducing Pressures on Natural Resources from Competing Land Use in Non-irrigated Arid Mountain, Semi-desert and Desert Landscapes - CACILM | tba |

\*the current Project being evaluated

# ANNEX VI GEF Multi-Focal Area Projects in Uzbekistan and its immediate neighbours

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **GEF Multi-Focal Area Projects** | **Agency** | **Budget $** |
| Uzbekistan | * National Capacity Self-Assessment
* “Rio Conventions Project”
* Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change Mitigation
 | UNDPUNDPWB | 240,000480,00087.7 m |
| Turkmenistan | * National Capacity Self-Assessment
 | UNDP | 215,000 |
| Tajikistan | * National Capacity Self-Assessment
* Community Agriculture and Watershed Management
* Sustaining Agricultural Biodiversity in ... Climate Change
* Environmental Learning and Stakeholder Involvement...
* Small Grants Program
 | UNDPWBUNDPUNDPUNDP | 209,00017.8 m6.7 m470,000 |
| Kyrgystan | * National Capacity Self-Assessment
* Capacity Building for Improved National Financing...
 | UNDPUNDP | 205,000645,000 |
| Kazakhstan | * Drylands Management Project
* National Capacity Self-Assessment
* Improving Sustainability of PA System in Desert Ecosystems...
* Small Grants Program
 | WBUNDPUNDP | 10.28 m225,00019.67 m |
| Afghanistan | * National Capacity Self-Assessment
* Piloting Integrated... National Reporting to Rio Conventions
* Small Grants Program
 | UNEPUNEP | 215,0001.24 m |
|  | Total Funding | >$ 146 m |

# ANNEX VII Training Exercises organised by the Rio Conventions Project, 2010-2011

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Numbers of participants** |
| # | **Dates** | **Venue** | **Training event** | **Target group** | **female** | **male** | **total** |
| 1 | 31.Mar to 01.Apr.10 | ASSC | Pilot workshop on Rio Conventions | ASSC listeners | 11 | 60 | 71 |
| 2 | 21-22.May.2010 |  | Induction training on Rio Conventions | Environmental agencies staff | 10 | 13 | 23 |
| 3 | 1-2.July.2010 |  | Rio Conventions and Environmental financing  | Senior staff of national and regional EF | 8 | 39 | 47 |
| 4 | 28.July.2010 | UNDP  | Preparation of GEF-5 climate change project proposals | Representatives of government agencies  | 13 | 15 | 28 |
| 5 | 18Aug.2010 | UNDP  | Strengthening of integration of Rio Conventions  | Representatives of relevant agencies  | 8 | 10 | 18 |
| 6 | 15.Sep.2010 | Poytakht BC | Discussion of recommendations to improve environmental policy in Uzbekistan | Representatives of key stakeholders | 9 | 22 | 31 |
| 7 | 14-15.October.2010 | Poytakht BC | Review of international practice in EFs  | Staff of national and regional EF | 5 | 30 | 35 |
| 8 | 29-30.Oct.2010 | Urgench | Field work in Land and water use management  | ASSC trainees and trainers | 7 | 44 | 51 |
| 9 | 29-30.Oct.2010 | Croatia | Study tour for selected EF staff | Selected staff of the National and Regional EFs | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 10 | 5-6.Mar.2011 |  | Integration of environmental priorities into WIS | IFMR, Uzhydromet, MoE MAWR | 10 | 13 | 23 |
| 11 | 27.May.2011 | Tashkent  | Environmental issues and legislation | Members of Uzbek Parliament | 27 | 50 | 77 |
| 12 | 8.Jun.2011 | UNDP  | Presentation of pilot teaching module | ASSC, UrDU, institute of higher education | 11 | 25 | 36 |
| 13 | 16.Jun.2011 | Poytaht BC | Modern methods of environmental planning | Uzhydromet, MoE, MAWR, others | 12 | 23 | 35 |
| 14 | 27.Jun to 3.July.2011 | Prague | Study tour of SEA in Czech Republic  | nominated agency officials | 2 | 11 | 13 |
| 15 | 8.Sep.2011 | Poytaht BC | Main aspects of SEA and EIA | national and regional ecological experts | 5 | 27 | 32 |
| 16 | 9-12.Nov.2011 | Poytaht BC | Implementation of Epoos Convention and SEA Protocol | Senior officials from five regions (Jizzah, Fergana, Samarkand, Navoiy, Tashkent) and Tashkent city CNP; Uzhydromet, Ministry of Economy, other agencies | 17 | 18 | 35 |
|  17 | 15-16.Sep.2011 | Poytaht BC | New PCM guidelines for EFsNew information system under development | Senior officials from regional economic and EF units. | 11 | 32 | 43 |
|  18 | 4-Nov.2011 | Bukhara | Implementation of new EF information system | Senior staff from economic and EF units of Karakalpakstan, Khorezm, Samarkand, Bukhara, Kashkadarya, Surhandarya and Navoi regions. | 10 | 21 | 31 |
| 19 | 18-Nov.2011 | Ferghana | Implementation of new EF information system | Senior staff from economic and EF units of Jizzakh, Syrdarya, Ferghana, Andijan, Namangan, Tashkent regions and Tashkent city. | 7 | 21 | 28 |
|  | COMPONENT 1. |  |  |  | 143 | 336 | **479** |
|  | COMPONENT 2. |  |  |  | 41 | 143 | **184** |
|  | PROJECT TOTALS |  |  |  | 184 | 479 | **663** |
|  |  |  |  |  | *28 %* | *72 %* |  |

# ANNEX VIII Summary of Project Plan, Budget and Expenditure



# ANNEX IX Uzbekistan Rio Conventions Project ~ Capacity Development Scorecard

completed by Final Evaluation

| **Capacity Result**  | **Staged Indicators** | **Rating** | **Score** | **Comments** | **Next Steps** | **Outcome Contribution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CR 1: Capacities for engagement** |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 1** – Degree of legitimacy/ mandate of lead environmental education organizations | Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined | 0 | **1**  | Several agencies have overlapping responsibilities for different aspects of environmental planning and management |  |  |
| Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are identified | 1 |
| Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders | 2 |
| Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders | 3 |
| **Indicator 2** – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms | No co-management mechanisms are in place | 0 | **1** | There is little evidence of genuine co-management of shared environmental issues |  |  |
| Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational | 1 |
| Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MoUs, etc. | 2 |
| Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional | 3 |
| **Indicator 3** – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups | Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor | 0 | **1** | There seems to be considerable consultation but little genuine participation in decision-making  |  |  |
| Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited | 1 |
| Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established | 2 |
| Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes | 3 |
| **Total score for CR1** | **3/9** |  |  |  |
| **CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge** |  |  |
| **Indicator 4** – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders | Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions  | **0** | **2** | There seems to be reasonable awareness of prevailing environmental issues in Uzbekistan – though probably inadequate considering the scale and urgency of the issues. By contrast there does not seem any urgent, common agenda to seek and frame solutions and drive effective actions  |  |  |
| Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions  | **1** |
| Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate | **2** |
| Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions | 3 |
| **Indicator 5** – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders | The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate | 0 | **2** |  |  |  |
| The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate | 1 |
| The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited | 2 |
| Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure | 3 |
| **Indicator 6** – Existence of environmental education programmes | No environmental education programmes are in place | 0 | **1** |  |  |  |
| Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered | 1 |
| Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered | 2 |
| Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered | 3 |
| **Indicator 7** – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development | No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes | 0 | **1** |  |  |  |
| Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes | 1 |
| Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs | 2 |
| Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development | 3 |
| **Indicator 8** – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making | Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes | 0 | **0** |  |  |  |
| Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes | 1 |
| Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes | 2 |
| Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes | 3 |
| **Total score for CR2** | **6/15** |  |  |  |
| **CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development** |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 9** – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process | The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies | 0 | **1** |  |  |  |
| The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used | 1 |
| Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems | 2 |
| The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented | 3 |
| **Indicator 10** – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks | The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment | 0 | **2** |  |  |  **2** |
| Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced | 1 |
| Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them | 2 |
| Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions | 3 |
| **Indicator 11** – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making | The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking | 0 | **2** |  |  | **2** |
| Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes | 1 |
| Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly | 2 |
| Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions | 3 |
| **Total score for CR3** | **5/9** |  |  |  |
| **CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 12** – Existence and mobilization of resources | The environmental organizations don’t have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed | 0 | **2** |  |  |  |
| The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed | 1 |
| The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed | 2 |
| Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations | 3 |
| **Indicator 13** – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer | The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified | 0 | **2** |  |  |  |
| The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources | 1 |
| The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources | 2 |
| The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies | 3 |
|  **Total score for CR4** | **4/6** |  |  |  |
| **CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate** |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 14** – Adequacy of the project monitoring process | Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme | 0 | **2** |  |  |  |
| An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted | 1 |
| Regular participative monitoring of results is being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team | 2 |
| Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action | 3 |
| **Indicator 15** – Adequacy of the project evaluation process | None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources | 0 | **1** |  |  |  |
| An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted | 1 |
| Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team | 2 |
| Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team | 3 |
|  **Total score for CR5** | **3/6** |  |  |  |
| **Combined total score for CR1-CR5** | **21/30** |  |  |  |

**ANNEX XI Planning and Monitoring Tools developed for the Rio Conventions Project**

1. **Logical Framework**

**Project Proposal Annex 4 Logical Framework Matrix**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Goal: To effectively mainstream global environmental priorities into national development planning and management processes of Uzbekistan** |
| **Objective/ Outcomes** | **Indicator/ Scorecard** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions and Risks** |
| **Project Objective:**To build national capacity for more effective environmental management in Uzbekistan by improved national environmental policy planning and implementation. | SPEP development and implementation becomes participatory national environmental planning process that fully accommodates global environmental targets. EFs management and operation capacity improved to finance national and global environmental priorities.Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating | SPEP process is not focused on achieving defined results. The planning process of the EF resources distribution is not structured to accommodate global environmental priorities of the country as well as it does not address the needs of the stakeholders outside the authority of the SCNP. The resources of the EFs are distributed thinly between the focal areas and priorities are not set. An amount of the available financial resources is a constraint for full-fledged realization of the existing environmental priorities. *Ratings to be completed at project inception phase* | Set of procedures introduced to improve participation of the key stakeholders into the SPEP formulation and implementation. By end of the project, the SPEP implementation and EF resource distribution are streamlined to address environmental prioritiesQuality management system introduced to improve effectiveness of the EFs operations. By the end of the project, the EFs’ resources available for the open application process are increased by 50% from the current amount.By the end of the project, at least 50% of decision makers who have received training according to the developed curriculum in the State Academy for State and Public Construction under the President of Uzbekistan have positive attitude towards improving the situation in the area of environment protection and have strong commitments to integrate environmental concerns during fulfilling his/her job responsibilities.*Targets to be established at project inception phase* | Project reportsIndependent evaluationProject documents of applicants for EF funding.Adopted regulations of the EF operations and stipulated criteria.A list of attendees of the training courses in the AcademySurveys of the training courses attendeesAccounting books of the EFsReports from the SCNPA list of projects funded after having gone through the application process of the EFNCSA documents | UZB remains committed to integrating global environmental considerations into environmental planning processes;SCNP remains the key responsible Ministry for SPEP implementation; SCNP, Uzhydromet, MAWR and other key stakeholders are responsive and committed to testing opportunities of cooperationThe project is successful in establishing public monitoring of the process with EF funds distribution.The State Academy for State and Public Construction under the President of Uzbekistan is supportive to the initiative and agrees to include the curriculum into its study programme Adequate trainers’ capacities are available or managed to be built during the timeframe of project implementation.The SCNP is open to cooperation and aims to increase cost-effectiveness of the resources distributed from the EFsThe SCNP is committed to making the need of putting national environmental concerns higher than the necessity to implementing the mandate of the SCNP solely by own means  |
| **Outcome 1:**Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives | SPEP implementation and EFs programming are harmonised to address national and global environmental prioritiesImproved technical capacity of the environmental institutions and key decision makers to mainstream global environmental targets into the national environmental and development frameworks  | Currently SPEP and the EFs programming and funding decisions are very loosely connected. There are no clear-cut links between the main environmental planning process and the key funding mechanism for environmental protection. Neither the planning or funding mechanisms fully accommodate country’s obligations under the global environmental conventions. There is a clear need to improve skills and knowledge of the respective institutions’ personnel to identify and formulate environmental priorities. Even though some attempts to enhance the personnel capacities are made through training facilities within some ministries), the targeted training programme to apprehend environmental policy issues is not existent.  | By end of the project set of procedures and rules and regulations introduced to improve the SPEP process. By end of the project indicator framework is developed to accommodate global environmental targets into the SPEPBy end of the project, the first group of decision makers is successfully trained according to developed and certified training programmes By the end of the project, adequate training capacities in form of prepared trainers, training materials and established agreement with the hosting academic institution are in place. | Project reports;Training accreditation and other related records;Independent evaluation Exams and tests for the involved personnel of the governmental agencies | The environmental institutions are willing to put in place institutional incentives to encourage staff to acquire and apply skills related to mainstreaming of Rio Conventions in environmental planning;Decision making institutions are supportive to sending its personnel to the training courses.Adequate access to necessary data can be effectively ensured; |
| **Outcome 2:** Improved financial management capacity of the environmental funds for increased global environmental financing | Environmental Funds management and operation capacity increased | Currently EFs have very poor management and operational capacity. There is very limited participation of the key stakeholders in the funding decision-making. The fund governing bodies and the key personnel are not very well aware of the national and global environmental priorities that the fund may finance. The decisions are made at very ad-hoc basis and the available national resources are ineffectively utilised. The personnel have limited skills and knowledge of quality management system that includes all key elements of planning and programming cycle, including the monitoring and evaluation. There are no selection criteria or other important management and decision-making tools that will considerably improve the Funds operations. Resource mobilisations skills are also limited and currently seem unfeasible. But can be achieved once the fund demonstrates effectiveness and result oriented functioning | By end of the project quality management system is in place to improve the management and operations of the EFs At least two activities identified as priorities for both global environmental compliance and national environmental management have been approved by the EF for financing. By end of project, the members of the EF councils are trained to identify and evaluate project proposals according to the result-oriented criteria By end of the project the EFs are able to attract external financial resources.  | Communication between potential partnersOfficial records; | Environmental Funds are replenished by the environmental charges and feesGovernment is committed to negotiate for attracting international investments into environment protection  |

**Inception Report Annex 5: Revised Log-Frame**

| **Project Strategy** | **Revised Indicators** |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target at EoProject** | **SoV** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Goal** | **To effectively mainstream global environmental priorities into national development planning and management processes of Uzbekistan.** |
| **Objective:**To build national capacity for more effective environmental management in Uzbekistan, by improved national environmental policy planning and implementation. | Improved and adequately modified SPEP development process to better accommodating global environmental targets and to addressing the needs of stakeholders  | SPEP process is not focused on achieving defined results. It does not address the needs of the stakeholders outside the authority of the SCNP | Set of modified procedures introduced to improve participation of the key stakeholders into the SPEP formulation and implementation. Indicator framework is developed to accommodate global environmental targets into the SPEP | * Project reports
* Independent evaluation
* Adopted amendments to procedures and rules
 | * Uzbekistan remains committed to integrating commitments made under the three Rio Conventions into relevant national policies(***political***)
* SCNP, Uzhydromet, MAWR, the Academy for State and Social Construction under the President of Uzbekistan and all other relevant stakeholders are responsive and committed to implementing the project in good spirit of cooperation (***political***)
* The objective of the project might be too ambitious to achieve and the support from the project and/or government resources may not be adequate to achieve the changes required by the project strategy (***strategic***)
 |
| Enhanced EF management and operations capacity to better financing national and global environmental priorities | EF governing bodies and personnel have limited knowledge on modern finance management. They are not very well aware of the national and global environmental priorities that the fund may finance | New financial management approaches and operational procedures developed and introduced to improve the effectiveness of EF in financing national and global environmental priorities | * Adopted amendments to EF Rules
* Project reports
 |
| Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating | Capacity for: * Engagement: 2 of 9
* Generate, access and use information and knowledge: n/a
* Policy and legislation development: 3 of 9
* Management and implementation: 3 of 6
* Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6

(total score: 12/42) | Capacity for: * Engagement: 4 of 9
* Generate, access and use information and knowledge: n/a
* Policy and legislation development: 6 of 9
* Management and implementation: 4 of 6
* Monitor and evaluate: 6 of 6

(total targeted score: 20/42) | * Final evaluation reports
* Annual PIRs
* Capacity assessment reports
 |
| **Outcome 1**: Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives. | Number of national policy makers trained in issues related to Rio Convention integration | Only few relevant decision makers and government officials have sufficient ability to ensure implementation of Rio Conventions. There are currently no related training courses | Min. 100 national policy makers and administrators received relevant training. At least two certified training courses and one workshop on modern policy making tools and methods for policy makers have been delivered | * Training reports
* Training Manuals
* A list of attendees of the training course
* Surveys of the training course attendees
 | * The government is not committed to implement recommendations elaborated by the project that would require revisions to relevant policies related to the three Rio Conventions (strategic, political)
* Key agencies and managers in ministries do not give a high priority to policy integration solutions as elaborated by the project (operational)
* The Academy for State and Social Construction under the President of Uzbekistan might not be interested in integrating into their training catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project (operational)
* Trainers with the required skills are available or can be trained during the project (operational)
* An insufficient number of trainees interested in receiving the training developed and offered by the project might result in failure to achieve all required project outputs (strategic)
* Lack of relevant local and/or international expertise may result in delays of required outputs or failure to achieve all required outputs (operational)
 |
| Better harmonized SPEP implementation and EF’s programming to addressing national and global environmental priorities | SPEP implementation and EF’s programming are loosely connected. The planning process of the EF resources distribution is not structured to accommodate global environmental priorities | Set of procedures and rules to improve SPEP implementation and EF resource distribution developed and approved by the SCNP | * Experts’ report
* Independent evaluation
* Adopted amendments to procedures and rules
 |
| Issues related to national and global environmental priorities are integrated into curricula of selected higher educational institutions | There are currently no specific training modules or courses within the curriculum of higher educational institutions related to national and global environmental issues  | Specific training module or course related to national and global environmental issues developed and integrated into curriculum of min. 1 higher educational institution | * Training accreditation and other related records
* Training Manuals
* Surveys of the training course attendees
 |
| **Outcome 2**: Improved financial management capacity of the National Environmental Fund for increased global environmental financing. | Availability and use of information on best international practice (CCE, CIS, etc.) in operations of environmental financial mechanisms by EF management | Detailed information on experience in managing EFs in CEE and CIS is currently not available although the EF could learn from such experience | Report on good international practice in managing public environmental expenditure schemes in 2-3 countries of CEE or CIS completed, presented and submitted to EF management and to interested stakeholders | * International Expert’s report
* Reports from the SCNP
 | * The EF is abolished during project duration or its spending priorities are shifted such that it cannot support anymore projects related to the three Rio Conventions (***political***)
* Proposed changes to the current EF legislation as well as other proposed changes related to the management and operations of the EF is not adopted by the EF, SCNP and/or Government (***political***)
* Trainers with the required skills are available or can be trained during the project (***operational***)
* Lack of relevant local and/or international expertise may result in delays of required outputs or failure to achieve all required outputs (***operational***)
 |
| Number and quality of proposals and recommendations to upgrade the operational performance of the EF accepted and introduced in EF rules | Currently there is no comprehensive strategic approach on further developing the operational management of the EF based on good international practice. | Comprehensive strategy papers on upgrading the operational performance of the EF submitted to and discussed with the EF senior management.At least 50% of recommendations of the strategy accepted for introduction in EF rules | * Experts’ report
* Reports from the SCNP
* Adopted amendments to EF rules
 |
| Number of specific trainings on operational management of EF and number of EF staff successfully completed these trainings | EF staff has not received substantive training on good international EF management practice, including training on Rio Convention integration | Min. two training courses delivered to at least 30 EF staff. EF staff has gained substantive new knowledge on state of the art operational management of EF | * Training reports
* Training Manuals
* A list of attendees of the training course
* Surveys of the training course attendees
 |
| **Outcome 3**: Project management, budget/cost. | Consistency of project management with UNDP and GEF standards | Management procedures not in place | UNDP and GEF standards used consistently by the project management team  | * Project progress reports & PIRs
* Evaluation reports
 | * The project management team does not apply proper UNDP/GEF management and administration procedures (***operational***)
* The selected project team might not be sufficiently qualified to implement all required project outputs (***operational***)
 |
| Good practices and lessons learned packaged as knowledge products and disseminated through national and international networks | No knowledge products are available to the relevant stakeholders | Good practices and lessons learned are packaged into knowledge products and they are easily accessible and are accessed by relevant stake-holders and general public  | * Project web site
* Stakeholders web sites
* Publications, brochures
* References to this products and reports, and seminars
 |

1. **Project Document Table I:** **Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project GoalTo effectively mainstream global environmental priorities into national development planning and management processes of Uzbekistan** |
| **Intended output(s)** | **Output baseline** | **Output indicator(s)** | **Output targets**  | **Indicative activities** | **Responsible parties** | **Inputs** |
| **Output**National capacity for more effective environmental management in Uzbekistan is built, by improved national environmental policy planning and implementation. | 1. SPEP process is not focused on achieving defined results. The planning process of the EF resources distribution is not structured to accommodate global environmental priorities of the country as well as it does not address the needs of the stakeholders outside the authority of the SCNP;
2. The resources of the EFs are distributed thinly between the focal areas and priorities are not set. An amount of the available financial resources is a constraint for full-fledged realization of the existing environmental priorities;
 | 1. SPEP development and implementation becomes participatory national environmental planning process that fully accommodates global environmental targets. 2. EFs management and operation capacity improved to finance national and global environmental priorities. | **Target 1.1** Set of procedures introduced to improve participation of the key stakeholders into the SPEP formulation and implementation(2008-20011)**Target 1.**2 By end of the project, the SPEP implementation and EF resource distribution are streamlined to address environmental priorities. (2008-20011)**Target 1.3** Quality management system introduced to improve effectiveness of the EFs operations. (2008-20011)**Target 2.1** the EFs’ resources available for the open application process are increased by 50% from the current amount.. (2008-20011) **Target 2.2** A least 50% of decision makers who have received training according to the developed curriculum in the State Academy for State and Public Construction under the President of Uzbekistan have positive attitude towards improving the situation in the area of environment protection and have strong commitments to integrate environmental concerns during fulfilling his/her job responsibilities. (2008-20011) | 1. **Activity Result**

Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives.* + **Action 1**

Introduction of a new mechanism for coordinated environmental planning and management for SPEP and programming from environmental funds; * + **Action 2**

Improvement of professional capacity of the environmental institutions to develop, formulate and evaluate effectiveness of the environmental programmes and environmental plans.1. **Activity Result**

Improved financial management capacity of the National Environmental Fund for increased global environmental financing* + **Action 1**

Introduction of fund management tools for improved operations of the EFs;* **Action 2**

Improvement of Skills and knowledge of the EF personnel to effectively manage EF; | Activity 1The State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan for nature protection, Center of Hydrometeorological Services under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of UzbekistanActivity 2The State Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan for nature protection, Center of Hydrometeorological Services under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan | **TOTAL for the Activity 1 – $130,000****(in-kind UNDP: $34,000; Govt.: $32,000)****Year 2009** – **$51,800** (IC, NCs, admin &management cost, travels)**Year 2010** - **$51,800** (IC, NC, admin &management cost)**Year 2011** – **$26,400** (IC, NCs, project admin &management cost, publishing)**TOTAL for the Activity 2 –** **$303,000****(in-kind UNDP: $34,000; Govt.: $32,000)****Year 2009** – **$124,300** (NCs)**Year 2010** – **$118,300** (equipment, NCs, travels)**Year 2011** – **$60,400** (NCs)**TOTAL for the Activity 3 – $42,000****(in-kind UNDP: $17,000; Govt.: $16,000)****Year 2009** – **$16,800** (NCs)**Year 2010** – **$16,800** (NCs, study tour, workshops, seminars, trainings, travels)**Year 2011** – **$8,400** (NCs, workshops, seminars, trainings, travels)**TOTAL FOR OUTPUT:****$475,000** |

1. **List of Project Outputs and Main Project Activities - from Inception Report pp6-8**

**Output 1.1: “A new mechanism for coordinated environmental planning and management is introduced for SPEP and programming from environmental funds”**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Preparation of a policy assessment on current shortcomings in integrating commitments contained in the Rio Conventions into national policy including recommendations on introducing modifications into SPEP development and implementation process
 |
| 1. Review of international experience in integrating Rio Convention commitments into national policy (min. 2 country case studies per Convention); including lessons learned for Uzbekistan
 |
| 1. Round table discussion of key stakeholders to consolidate and discuss the findings of the policy assessment
 |
| 1. Development of policy planning tools, such as: result-oriented planning; stakeholder inclusion techniques; indicator-based planning; policy monitoring tools; financial planning tools for policy-making
 |
| 1. Development of recommendations on modification of existing environment monitoring system including the adoption of a set of indicators illustrating the progress of Uzbekistan in achieving objectives of the Rio Conventions.
 |
| 1. Development of recommendations on introducing adequate procedures towards harmonization of SPEP development process with programming under the Environmental Fund
 |
| 1. Delivery of specific workshops for relevant policy makers to develop concrete solutions and recommendations aimed at better integration of Rio Conventions commitments into national policies
 |

**Output 1.2: “Professional capacity of the environmental institutions to develop, formulate and evaluate effectiveness of the environmental programmes and environmental plans improved”**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Preparing training material for targeted group of practitioners and policy makers from relevant agencies aimed at better integration of Rio Conventions commitments into national policies
 |
| 1. Delivery of specific trainings for targeted group of practitioners and policy makers from relevant agencies aimed at better integration of Rio Conventions commitments into national policies
 |
| 1. Development of training module/material for Training of Trainers (ToT) at the ASSC on one or several of the following topics:
 |
| * 1. Integration of Rio Conventions commitments into policy development and implementation
 |
| * 1. Project preparation techniques, with a focus on project preparation related to Rio Conventions
 |
| * 1. Applied environmental economics with a focus on Rio Conventions
 |
| 1. Test the ToT material with trainers of the Academy for State and Social Construction under President of Uzbekistan
 |
| 1. Finalization and introduction of a specific course on environmental issues into the curriculum of the Academy for State and Social Construction under President of Uzbekistan
 |
| 1. Development in cooperation with the GEF SGP in Uzbekistan of a training module related to environmental economics and finance at the Namangan Institute of Economics and Engineering (Namangan Province). Introduction of a relevant course into the Institute curriculum.
 |
| 1. Study tour of practitioners and decision makers from relevant agencies to one of the countries succeeded in integrating commitments contained in Rio Conventions into national policy.
 |

**Output 2.1: Fund management tools introduced for improved operations of the EF**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Assessment of current operational management of EF in Uzbekistan, including the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) to effective functioning of the EF
 |
| 1. Assessment of the current financing market in Uzbekistan (focus on investment areas related to the Rio Conventions)
 |
| 1. Review of international good practice in operational management (2-3 environmental funds in selected countries of CEE and CIS)
 |
| 1. Elaboration of draft proposals and recommendations for upgrading the operations of the Uzbek EF in key operational management areas
 |
| 1. Discussion and further approval of proposed recommendations by senior EF management
 |
| 1. Preparation and submission to SCNP draft amendments to EF Rules and respective government resolutions related to EF management and operations.
 |

**Output 2.2: Skills and knowledge of the EF personnel improved to effectively manage EF.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Preparation of training material for specific training to EF staff (based on material elaborated under output 2.1)
 |
| 1. Delivery of training to staff of national and regional EF
 |
| 1. Study tour of selected EF personnel to one or two EFs in Central and Eastern Europe or CIS (e.g., Czech Republic, Bulgaria or Slovenia)
 |

1. **Set of Expected Results**

**From Inception Report p.5**

| **Set of Expected Results** |
| --- |
| ***Goal***To effectively mainstream global environmental priorities into national development planning and management processes of Uzbekistan |
| ***Objective***To build national capacity for more effective environmental management in Uzbekistan, by improved national environmental policy planning and implementation. |
| ***Outcome 1***: Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives.***Output 1.1****: A new mechanism for coordinated environmental planning and management is introduced for SPEP and programming from environmental funds.****Output 1.2****: Professional capacity of the environmental institutions to develop, formulate and evaluate effectiveness of the environmental programmes and environmental plans improved.* | ***Outcome 2***: Improved financial management capacity of the National Environmental Fund for increased global environmental financing.***Output 2.1:*** *Fund management tools introduced for improved operations of the EF.****Output 2.2****: Skills and knowledge of the EF personnel improved to effectively manage EF.* | ***Outcome 3***: Project Management, budget/cost. |

**Inception Report Revision of Indicators, Baseline, Targets** pp13-15

|  | **Proposed Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target by End of Project** | **Sources of verification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**To build national capacity for more effective environmental management in Uzbekistan, by improved national environmental policy planning and implementation. | 1. Improved and adequately modified SPEP development process to better accommodating global environmental targets and to addressing the needs of stakeholders
 | * SPEP process is not focused on achieving defined results. It does not address the needs of the stakeholders outside the authority of the SCNP
 | * Set of modified procedures introduced to improve participation of the key stakeholders into the SPEP formulation and implementation. Indicator framework is developed to accommodate global environmental targets into the SPEP
 | * Project reports
* Independent evaluation
* Adopted amendments to procedures and rules
 |
| 1. Enhanced EF management and operations capacity to better financing national and global environmental priorities
 | * EF governing bodies and personnel have limited knowledge on modern finance management. They are not very well aware of the national and global environmental priorities that the fund may finance
 | * New financial management approaches and operational procedures developed and introduced to improve the effectiveness of EF in financing national and global environmental priorities
 | * Adopted amendments to EF Rules
* Project reports
 |
|  | 1. Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating
 | Capacity for: * Engagement: 2 of 9
* Generate, access and use information and knowledge: n/a
* Policy and legislation development: 3 of 9
* Management and implementation: 3 of 6
* Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6
* (total score: 12/42)
 | Capacity for: * Engagement: 4 of 9
* Generate, access and use information and knowledge: n/a
* Policy and legislation development: 6 of 9
* Management and implementation: 4 of 6
* Monitor and evaluate: 6 of 6
* (total targeted score: 20/42)
 | * Final evaluation reports
* Annual PIRs
* Capacity assessment reports
 |
| **Outcome 1**: Improved environmental planning and management to accommodate global environmental objectives. | 1. Number of national policy makers trained in issues related to Rio Convention integration
 | * Only few relevant decision makers and government officials have sufficient ability to ensure implementation of Rio Conventions. There are currently no related training courses
 | * Min. 100 national policy makers and administrators received relevant training. At least two certified training courses and one workshop on modern policy making tools and methods for policy makers have been delivered
 | * Training reports
* Training Manuals
* A list of attendees of the training course
* Surveys of the training course attendees
 |
| 1. Better harmonized SPEP implementation and EF’s programming to addressing national and global environmental priorities
 | * SPEP implementation and EF’s programming are loosely connected. The planning process of the EF resources distribution is not structured to accommodate global environmental priorities
 | * Set of procedures and rules to improve SPEP implementation and EF resource distribution developed and approved by the SCNP
 | * Experts’ report
* Independent evaluation
* Adopted amendments to procedures and rules
 |
| 1. Issues related to national and global environmental priorities are integrated into curricula of selected higher educational institutions
 | * There are currently no specific training modules or courses within the curriculum of higher educational institutions related to national and global environmental issues
 | * Specific training module or course related to national and global environmental issues developed and integrated into curriculum of min. 1 higher educational institution
 | * Training accreditation and other related records
* Training Manuals
* Surveys of the training course attendees
 |
| **Outcome 2**: Improved financial management capacity of the National Environmental Fund for increased global environmental financing. | 1. Availability and use of information on best international practice (CCE, CIS, etc.) in operations of environmental financial mechanisms by EF management
 | * Detailed information on experience in managing EFs in CEE and CIS is currently not available although the EF could learn from such experience
 | * Report on good international practice in managing public environmental expenditure schemes in 2-3 countries of CEE or CIS completed, presented and submitted to EF management and to interested stakeholders
 | * International Expert’s report
* Reports from the SCNP
 |
| 1. Number and quality of proposals and recommendations to upgrade the operational performance of the EF accepted and introduced in EF rules
 | * Currently there is no comprehensive strategic approach on further developing the operational management of the EF based on good international practice
 | * Comprehensive strategy papers on upgrading the operational performance of the EF submitted to and discussed with the EF senior management. At least 50% of recommendations of the strategy accepted for introduction in EF rules
 | * Experts’ report
* Reports from the SCNP
* Adopted amendments to EF rules
 |
| 1. Number of specific trainings on operational management of EF and number of EF staff successfully completed these trainings
 | * EF staff has not received substantive training on good international EF management practice, including training on Rio Convention integration
 | * Min. two training courses delivered to at least 30 EF staff. EF staff has gained substantive new knowledge on state of the art operational management of EF
 | * Training reports
* Training Manuals
* A list of attendees of the training course
* Surveys of the training course attendees
 |
| **Outcome 3:** Project management, budget/cost. | 1. Consistency of project management with UNDP and GEF standards
 | * Management procedures not in place
 | * UNDP and GEF standards used consistently by the project management team
 | * Progress reports & PIRs
* Evaluation reports
 |
| 1. Good practices and lessons learned packaged as knowledge products and disseminated through national and international networks
 | * No knowledge products are available to the relevant stakeholders
 | * Good practices and lessons learned are packaged into knowledge products and they are easily accessible and are accessed by relevant stake-holders and general public
 | * Project web site
* Stakeholders web sites
* Publications, brochures
* References to this products and reports, and seminars
 |

1. In this regard, this evaluation is not a financial audit. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See p. 16 of the GEF’s Monitoring and Evaluation Policy [↑](#footnote-ref-2)