Project is financed
by the European Union

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN
AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

«Promoting Integrated Water Resources Management and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia»

H.M. BOSCH

THE NETHERLANDS

Table of Contents

Cover page

Project Title	**Promoting IWRM and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia**
UNDAF Outcome(s):	n/a
Expected CP Outcome(s):	Strengthened regional capacity to address water governance challenges within national and transboundary sustainable development frameworks
Expected Output(s):	- Output 1: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Kyrgyzstan - Output 2: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Tajikistan - Output 3: Transboundary Dialogue and Cooperation in the Ili-Balkhash River Basin - Output 4: Regional Dialogue, IWRM Governance and Sector Capacity Building
Executing Entity:	UNDP, Bratislava Regional Centre
Implementing Agencies:	UNDP Kazakhstan (Output 3); UNDP Kyrgyzstan (Output 1); UNDP Tajikistan (Output 2); Bratislava Regional Centre (Output 4)

Brief Description: Several regional agreements have proven ineffective and sector donors are refocusing on bi-lateral agreements and building national IWRM capacity. While the Aral Sea Basin is closed (water is limiting) developed land, equipped with functional infrastructure, is the resource. Therefore, rather than absolute scarcity, improved governance and sectoral service delivery are among the key water management challenges in Central Asia. The project – building on successful experience with introducing IWRM in Kazakhstan – will aim to promote transboundary dialogue and sustainable water resources management in Central Asia through interventions at national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and at transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China). *In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan*, the objective will be to develop and implement national integrated water resources management and water efficiency strategies (IWRM Strategies) at national and basin level. In doing this, the project will focus on concrete interventions to improve: irrigated agriculture, rural water supply and sanitation, and small-scale hydropower service delivery, under the umbrella of IWRM governance and institutional reform. *In the Ili-Balkash River Basin*, the aim is to foster transboundary dialogue and enhance cooperation between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China for improved management of the shared River Basin system and its resources. *On a regional level*, the programme aims at efficient and effective projects management, knowledge exchange as well as trans-regional coordination and capacity building interventions.

Programme Period: 2008-2012
Key Result Area (Strategic Plan): Mainstreaming environment and energy; Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor

Atlas Award ID: 56531 ___
Start date: 01 Oct 2008
End Date planned 31 Dec 2012
End Date actual June 2013
PAC Meeting Date 29 May 2008

Management Arrangements DIM

Total resources planned: **USD 5,400,000**
Total allocated resources: **USD 4,400,000**
UNDP Regular and co-funding:
USD 854,000 (originally planned 350,000)
Other:
EC EUR 1,500,000 (1,940,000 USD)
ENVSEC: 255,000 USD
Finland: EUR 100,000 (128,000 USD)
Norway: 0 / (originally planned USD 800,000)
Parallel funding
IWRM Projects of UNDP and other donors: 1,223,000 USD
(to cover originally unfunded budget of USD 900,000)
In-kind Contributions
- Govt (Kaz) USD 600,000
- Govt (Kyr) USD 200,000
- Govt (Taj) USD 200,000

Executive summary

The project "Promoting Integrated Water Resource Management and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia" has been implemented by UNDP via its Bratislava Regional Center (BRC – regional component 4 and Project Management) and three country offices (COs): Kyrgyzstan (component 1), Tajikistan (component 2) and Kazakhstan (component 3).

This current terminal evaluation report covers the time period of, the initial project duration: December 2008-December 2012 (as per contract with EC). The project has been extended until June 2013 in order to finalize activities funded by other then EU donors. All project components are being finalised, except the sub-component on Chu-Talas Climate Change Adaptation – which is in full implementation. This activity has been included into the project only in 2010 (as per addendum to the Contract with EC) and therefore more time is needed to finalize it.

There are several other on-going projects and initiatives in the water management sector in Central Asia which are funded by the European Union, UN agencies, German and Swiss governments, and other international donors. Some of these initiatives have similar objectives and aims as the current project. Therefore, in order to maximize synergies between all initiatives in the region, the project is coordinating with other initiatives and partners. In some cases this leads to refining project work plans and restructuring of certain project activities. However, this is in line with the desired adaptive management approach and does not pose a risk to the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.

The project has already facilitated positive impacts and inputs towards national policies and reforms, particularly in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan as described in more details below, and the same type of activities have been started in Kazakhstan following the recommendation of the previous monitoring mission and requests from the governmental partners.

Demonstration projects are either already finalized or close to the end of their implementation phase, covering different sectors according to the project mandate, and providing a good overview of different IWRM principles and approaches used on the local and transboundary levels.

Transboundary and regional activities are on-going as planned and are in close cooperation with riparian states, and relevant regional structures and partners.

The project team assisted with several EU monitoring missions that were carried out in 2010, 2011 and 2012 and participated in the meetings with project stakeholders. The findings of the monitoring missions have been addressed in both the project planning and implementation.

The project can be looked at as a range of activities with the production of range of verifiable outputs, or as a process support process with monitoring on effective sustainable outputs.

As the project has been using 2 logframes from EU and UNDP which have different target and have to be used in a different way, the choice has been made on process monitoring based on sustainable effective outputs.

As two management systems were partly forced on the project, the project was squeezed with not optimal management support. This should be prevented in future as agreed in the FAFA.

At the same time it is concluded that the UNDP project management system ATLAS is not supplying to full extend instrumentation for field project management in controlling the outputs, deviations, risk, and assumptions.

Rating of Evaluation

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***Rating***
M&E design at entry	S	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	MS
Overall quality of M&E	S	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**Rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**Rating**
Relevance	R	Financial resources:	ML
Effectiveness	S	Socio-political:	ML
Efficiency	MS	Institutional framework and governance:	L
Overall Project Outcome Rating	S	Environmental :	ML
Impact	S	Overall likelihood of sustainability:	ML

The obligatory rating scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) ***Impact Ratings:*** 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

As mentioned the objective of the project is to promote IWRM and fostered transboundary dialogue in Central Asia through national interventions in an effective way. Especially in Tajikistan it catalysed the development of IWRM on national technical and political level. IWRM has been brought to top political level. On basin level it was demonstrated that implementation can to a large extent take place without all national instrumentation in place. Linking economic aspect, political aspects and technical management and demonstrate it on basin level showed to be effective.

In Kyrgyzstan in a combined effort of international organisations with good progress was made on institutional, organisational, economic and technical level.

Lacking sufficient funds for visible and recognisable outputs to project the project saw chance to create impact which catch the national interest with investment plans, automation of water works, investment plans, demonstrations, national federation of WUA, National Water Council.

Kazakhstan saw a chance to make under the pressure of lacking budgets to settle the Ili-Balkhaz Basin Council, to activate the stakeholders, decisions of the Council enforce through its members. Supplying organisations with an access point for information supply to the end user and supporting them to move from data supply to information supply raising the understanding on the basin and its management. Now the stakeholders are pushing the council and not only the council pushing the stakeholders.

Of course lot of bottlenecks are waiting solutions like the linking of water management with green economic development, water efficiency connected with improved land use, productivity and marketing to create sufficient profits to finance the water management.

As on field level 50-60 % of water can be saved on irrigation level 25-50% the focus should shift to demonstrations of profitable land use combined with water efficiency. By supporting the service organisation with tools like remote sensing, sensor techniques, GIS, modelling, scenario development, and water monitoring to catch up with the lacking data, the management can be brought to higher level.

Therefore increased and new capacity is needed. This is requiring young experts to access the labour market and transfer from knowledge from the aging key expert group to be transferred to young professionals. Extended use of Internships, trainee places, international study programmes, junior experts working under guidance of senior ones, are some of the tools.

As most activities in the basin has been focussing on sectoral aspects of water use these needs now to be integrated under RBM.

Transboundary management is built on trust and cooperation. This is only possible based on measuring, control and capacity on maintenance. Having equipment is allowing raise of own investment budget and as basis for credits.

Budget neutral approaches and economic modelling and forecasting will become essential tools.

Therefore investment budgets should be available: for small investment (25.000 usd/WUA) , seed money for attracting larger funds and investments (200.000 usd) and credit facilities together with the IFIs.

Pan regional activities should be focussing on demonstration of experience.

Parallel to demonstration and pilot projects replication should take place to increase the impact and spread the lessons learned. This should be combined with basic support to the replication basins.

List of Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BC	Bilateral Commission
BRC	Regional Centre for Europe & CIS, United Nations Development Program
CWR	Committee of Water Resources (Kazakhstan)
EDB	Eurasian Development Bank
EC-IFAS	Executing Committee of the International Fund for Aral Sea Saving
EU	European Union
FAFA	Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (between UNDP and EC)
GIZ	German Society for International Cooperation
GWP	Global Water Partnership
ICWC	Interstate Commission for Water Coordination
IMCC	Inter-Ministerial Coordination Council
ITL	International Team Leader
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
MMWRRT	Ministry of Melioration and Water Resources of the Republic of Tajikistan
NPD	National Policy Dialogue process
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
RWSS	Rural Water Supply and Sanitation
SC	Steering Committee
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SHP	Small Hydro Power
UN ECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UN RCCA	United Nations Regional Centre for Preventive Diplomacy for Central Asia
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USAID	The United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WMP	Water Management Plans
WUAs	Water Users Associations

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

Purpose of this evaluation is:

- to extract lessons learned from the project
- to advise on the project design especially related to co-financing by third partners
- to advice on a follow up of the project

1.2 Scope & Methodology

The scope and methodology of the evaluation is described in the guidelines for terminal monitoring of the UNDP.

The evaluation took place in December – March 2013. It consisted of desk review of key project documentation, field visits and interviews with local stakeholders and project management.

The evaluation mission was carried out in UNDP Bratislava and the Country Offices of UNDP Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan (detailed itinerary and list of person met is in the annex B and C.

The evaluation report follows the structure outlined in the ToR for evaluation and takes into consideration Logframe of UNDP and EC as one of the monitoring tools for the assessing the achieved results.

Complication in this project is the fact that the Logframe of the project is not really adapted to adaptive management. IWRM development is a process of adaptive management and multi-dimensional processes of resource use, knowledge brokers, and power brokers. Adaptive management is a process of learning from flexible management aimed on how to navigate towards progress.

Objective evaluation is in paradox with adaptive management as this is asking involvement, so engaged, independent, and objective is required. This process is as well as demand as supply driven. Failures are an essential aspect in the process of adaptive management. When the process is going in the right direction the failures offer challenges, when the process is going in the negative way it offers recommendations for corrections.

It is understood that the evaluation should offer information on policy level and knowledge level to reduce the information gap between them and highlighting the opportunities.

The project is facing the use of two not fully identical linear oriented logframes: the UNDP Logframe and the EU Logframe. Both have a principle difference as the UNDP sets target and the EU Logframe minimal verifiable indicators for success. This difference in approach cannot fully found back in the way the two logframes are filled in.

The output performance report and progress report, which is part of the EU Logframe approach is not used, leaving the team leader with half an instrument.

On the other side it is the question in how far a more or less linear Logframe is suitable for the management of a non-linear or multi-dimensional process of adaptive development, which is Integrated Water Resource Management.

To overcome this, the terminal monitoring will focus more on the RBM processes and sustainable results and the opportunities gained by the project, than on the logframes verifiable indicators for activities.

In line with the opportunities, attention will be given to options for continuation of the process of RBM in Central Asia.

1.3 Structure of the evaluation report

The structure of the evaluation report looks as follows:

After the introduction a description of the project will be given including problem identification, objective, indicators, main stakeholders and expected result.

Building on this the findings on project design, implementation and results will be compared with the project description.

This will be followed by conclusion, recommendations and lessons learned, and by proposals on the prospectives for future project development.

As the Final report was not available yet, the final outputs could not be included, but the field mission with a long list of interviews, and information supplied by the national coordinators and project management offered a good impression on the project and lessons learned.

2 Project description and development context

2.1 Project start and duration

The original project programming period was 2009 – 2012. The EU funded part of project was finalised on 15 December 2012, as per the Contract with the EC. The project has been extended by 30 June 2013 in order to finalize all project activities (in particular activities funded by other donors and implemented with other partners), including the reporting to the EC.

The formal start has been December 2008 (upon signature for the Contract with EC). However the effective start of project activities was delayed, due to the administrative processes that have taken more than expected (in particular finding and hiring the project staff in all COs).

The draft Inception Report was prepared in October 2009 for the Inception Workshop, where it was accepted by the Steering Committee. Thus the inception phase of the project took almost one year. There was also a need to review the planned project activities, as the original project concept was developed in 2007. Other water related initiatives were ongoing in the region, and there was a strong need for coordination with these activities.

This resulted in an effective implementation period of 3 years from 2010 to 2012 and a loss of 1 growing/irrigation season for the RBM demonstration projects.

Due to budget reasons, for example for Kyrgyzstan, just 3 years of effective implementation remained.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The challenging hydrological setting: The Central Asian Republics share the Aral Sea Basin (ASB) and are locked in a hydrological inter-dependence that transcends national boundaries. Rainfall in the Basin is generally low; about 87% of the runoff is generated by snow and glacier melt in the mountainous upstream countries. However, the three downstream countries, with 80% of the Central Asian population and 85% of the ASB irrigated land, account for 73% of total water abstractions (UN 2004).

Complex institutional and legal structures: An elaborate set of water and energy sharing agreements among the Republics of Central Asia largely broke down with the end of the Soviet era. The previously integrated regional water and electricity infrastructure was divided along the new national borders and started suffering from a lack of coordinated maintenance.

Moreover, the overuse and poor management of available water resources increasingly limits agricultural yields, while groundwater levels in the Aral Sea Basin continue to rapidly drop. At the same time, political stalemate on cooperation has limited the development of balanced hydro-power and agricultural potential.

Climate Change: predicted above-average warming and glacial retreat will likely exacerbate the water, agricultural and distributional problems in the region. Building capacity to be able to adapt to climate variability will be key for sustainable human development in the Aral Sea Basin.

From the Water-Energy Nexus towards Integrated Water, Energy and Food Security: While the Central Asian republics of the Former Soviet Union have so far avoided open conflict over water resources, their relations have been strained. This complex water-energy nexus could quickly deteriorate into a major economic, humanitarian and political crisis for the whole region in unfavourable years. Past attempts by the international community to reduce tensions – amid scarce political will among the key players – showed limited success, mainly due to the "top-down" nature of approaches and their limited or linear scope.

The global economic crisis appears likely to also hit the Central Asian economies, with the biggest impact on poor and marginalized groups. Besides job losses, the crisis may spill over into

environmental and public health sectors. Decisive and concerted action will be required by the international development community, together with local players, to mitigate economic consequences that could cause a humanitarian and poverty crisis.

UNDP's response: A rejuvenated strategy with concrete, on-the-ground activities

UNDP's overarching strategic approach in the Central Asian water sector is to tackle transboundary, disputable water issues by focusing on non-divisive, mutually beneficial and concrete action at national or local level. Besides the immediate aim to improve the concrete living conditions for people on the ground, the intention is to gradually build national capacities along with the governments' information base and willingness to tackle more complex, transboundary aspects with time.

While water resources in the Aral Sea Basin may become increasingly constrained, the more important limiting factor for efficient agricultural production is arable land equipped with functional infrastructure. Therefore, rather than absolute scarcity, improved water governance and sectoral service delivery are among the key challenges in Central Asia.

Moreover, an integrated, cross-sector approach is necessary to address water, energy and agriculture production issues, which are undoubtedly inter-linked. In its joint project with the European Union, UNDP is therefore seeking to promote Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), building on the success and lessons from a similar UNDP project in Kazakhstan (2004-2008).

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia, through interventions at both the national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).

In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan (Outputs 1 and 2), the objective will be to develop and implement national integrated water resources management and water efficiency strategies (IWRM Strategies) at national and basin level. In doing so , the project will focus on concrete interventions to improve: (i) irrigated agriculture; (ii) rural water supply and sanitation (RWSS); (iii) small-scale hydropower service delivery; and (iv) IWRM governance and institutional reform. In the Ili-Balkhash River Basin (Output 3), the aim is to foster transboundary dialogue and enhance cooperation between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China for improved management of the shared River Basin system and its resources. At a pan-regional level (Output 4), the aim is to build sub-regional capacity and provide adequate expert support to ensure efficient and effective project implementation, pan-regional coordination of activities (in and outside the scope of this project), as well as joint and coordinated capacity building and policy advise.

The sectoral activities (under outputs 1 & 2) will aim at two sets of key results:

1. Realistic national investment strategies, IWRM plans and financial policies, which will be informed by the results of;
2. Demonstration projects that develop both practical management instruments and feasibility studies for possible donor funding.

Other expected results include the development and implementation of: (i) a joint management agreement – for equitable water, energy and O&M cost sharing – in a small transboundary sub-basin, (ii) context-specific participatory IWRM processes, (iii) additional demonstration projects mainly relating to small-scale hydropower solutions, to address stakeholders next highest priorities, and (iv) context-specific institutional reforms.

2.4 Baseline Indicators established

The baseline indicators of the project under the UNDP Logframe are the following:

Kyrgyzstan:

- Wheat yield < 3 T ha-1
- Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited participatory processes
- No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans
- No investment strategies, plans or financial policies
- No TB agreements in effect
- No institutional integration

Tajikistan:

- Negligible wheat production
- Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited participatory processes
- No investment strategies, plans or financial policies
- No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans
- Initial Small-scale Hydropower investment strategy
- No TB agreements in effect
- No institutional integration

Kazakhstan:

- reluctantly enforced framework agreement
- Limited or un-systematic documentation
- No RB management plan
- No significant engagement of stakeholders

Central Asia

- Limited sector and organization management capacity
- Project implementation not yet started
- Limited capacity for integrating environment into water management planning

As the Logframe was amended to the EU format and a number of other indicators were chosen, a number of these baseline indicators lost their validity.

2.5 Main stakeholders

Main stakeholders can be divided in:

- Local
    - Administration
    - Private
    - WUA

    - NGOs and other local organisations
- Regional
    - Administration
    - Regional water management committee
    - River Basin Inspection
    - NGOs
    - Basin council
    - Council of WUAs
- National
    - Government / agencies
        - Min/dep. of water management
        - Min of environment
        - Min of Agriculture
        - Min of construction – water supply and sanitation
    - Federation of WUAs
    - NGOs
- International
    - Governments
        - Bi-lateral partners
    - International bodies
    - IFIs

Specific target groups by country:

Kyrgyzstan:

Oblast and Rayon DWRs, jointly with WUAs and NGO support; Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic on the Use of Water Management Facilities of Intergovernmental Status on the Rivers Chu and Talas, MAWR, MWRI and local authorities, with key stakeholder involvement, and assisted by NGOs; Village CBOs with DWS and DSE and NGO support;

Tajikistan:

Oblast and Rayon OMAs, jointly with WUAs and NGO support; MWRI, MoA, MEI and local authorities, with key stakeholder involvement, and assisted by NGOs; Village CBOs with OMA and/or SUE, and NGO support;

In selected transboundary pilot areas: Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and preferably also Uzbek authorities; NGOs and other stakeholders

Kazakhstan:

Water Resources Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of RK; Ministry of Environmental Protection; Joint Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and People's Republic of China for the Ili-Balkash River Basin; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization; Kazakhstan Meteorological Service (Kazgidromet).

Regional level:

Regional institutions like EC-IFAS, SIC, ICWC, CAP-NET, HELVETAS, GTZ, etc.

2.6 Expected Results

The countries are expecting visible and recognizable results to create project support, something which in the project design was not taken into account fully. Major visible and recognizable results were planned to be financed from the non-confirmed Norwegian budget which was not received.

For Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan

1. Realistic national targets, strategies, investment plans and financial policies, which will be informed by the results of demonstration projects (next result).

2. Demonstration projects that inform practical management instruments and feasibility studies and can be scaled-up and replicated, based on available national, donor or private sector funding.

3. Development and implementation of:

i. a joint management arrangements – for equitable water, energy and O&M cost sharing – in Isfara transboundary sub-basin;

ii. context-specific participatory IWRM processes - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers;

iii. context-specific institutional reforms - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers.

For Kazakhstan

4. Intensified bilateral cooperation activities and stakeholders engagement

5. Improved base for cooperation (such as provisions for the water-sharing agreement and raised capacities of the Commission, basin authorities and stakeholders)

For Central Asia regional level

6. Improved capacities of national and sub-regional stakeholders in IWRM activities

7. Sub-regional dialogue on IWRM implementation and addressing climate change issues under IWRM frameworks

8. Effective project management and implementation of project activities

3 Findings

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

Two different logframes were used to manage the project, one in UDP format, the other in EU format. In both of them different indicators were used. Following critics of the EU a more measurable EU logframe was introduced, instead of adapting the UNDP one. This makes it difficult to give a good analysis of indicators. As the baseline is only limited described in general terms this cannot be judged.

The design seems logic but lacking an IWRM umbrella for the activities bringing all activities together. Also climate change, a major impact on water management, was lacking. This problem has in a later stage of the project been corrected.

The pan-regional activities were too ambitious, and with the limited budget they could not be achieved in full extent. The logframe is in this not clear either. As it says to promote IWRM and fostering transboundary dialogue in Central Asia, at the same time it is formulated that the project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia **through interventions at national level** (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and **at transboundary level** (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).

The national interventions are worked out well but the Pan Regional activities are not fully in line with the main objective being through national interventions. The Pan regional activities were not focussing on national interventions but on pan regional capacity building and agreements, which showed in the past to be difficult to implement. Demonstration and sharing experience had been a better approach. The involvement of the other countries in the region (Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and China) was foreseen in the project, however it was limited and the risks underestimated. Uzbekistan has been participating in the Steering Committees of the project. Turkmenistan did not participate as there were no IWRM related activities ongoing. China has been involved through the Ili-Balkhas project (Kazakh component).

A good mix of activities is formulated on the different aspects of IWRM, from national level strategy and legal development till implementation and demonstration in the basins.

The spread of activities focussing on drinking water supply, financing mechanism for water management, National water councils, WUAs, farmers, information supply, technical water management, infrastructure development and stakeholder participation is at the same time a strong point of the project and a weak; weak because of too many activities running parallel of each other, but lacking a recognisable umbrella of IWRM. This was thus challenging for the project management. Due to the delay by the start of the project and due to limitations in financial resources, the integrated implementation and demonstration was squeezed to some extent

In the design little notice has been given to the fact that a project is with its limited timeframe in principle not sustainable. Sustainability is based on third parties taking over the ownership and / or institutionalising it, which should be the focus of the project.

It was planned that with help of IFIs larger scale replication should already start during the project. However no solid base was built in the design phase to realise this.

A major source for sustainable development is market financing. Economic aspects of natural resource management are in the design of the project little taken into account. Focus was mainly on (inter)national financing.

Budget neutral approaches (self-financing) of water resource management were not included in the project design.

Not all indicators are logically chosen. Some are not measurable or not measured by the project. Others like not useful as indicators like productivity less than xx. This indicator does not reflect productivity, as less than 3 ton/ha is also less than the 4 ton/ha aimed for. It is recommended that the baseline is better formulated and in the indicators minimums are taken up.

3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

In the Logframe assumptions are defined. In the inception report the risks are fine-tuned. The assumptions and risk are however not linked to each other.

During the project implementation these should be regularly adapted to new situations. In practice, the risks and issues have been identified and recorded in the UNDP management system ATLAS and updated as needed (in 2009, 2010, 2011). Each of the annual progress reports described "Emerging challenges and measures taken", but this was only partially aligned with the records in ATLAS.

The timeframe emerged between the initiation and the start of the project caused the project to operate in a changed institutional environment.

This was reflected during the project implementation. For example in Kazakhstan the project started to cooperate with the Balkhash-Alakol' Water Council that was not originally foreseen as a partner.

It is recommended to adapt the project to a changed institutional environment in future during the inception phase and not leaving it till the implementation.

Key issues and risks

In follow up on the project documents, during the inception period the key issues and risks were adapted.

The major issues were associated with the need to refine project plans due to the number of new initiatives and projects working in the same area, which took considerable time and delayed the project start. There was no need seen for serious changes in the project planning or logical framework, something which one year later became obvious.

The half year period mentioned under the countermeasures in the risk analysis was an underestimation as the inception phase took over one year.

It is interesting that the USD 900.000 uncovered budget (indicated in the original UNDP project document) was not seen as a risk.

However, the lack of funding from Norway, which was foreseen as the main co-funding partner of the project has been identified as a risk from the early stage of project implementation.

An additional "fund-raising" was foreseen during the project implementation, which has been realised to certain extent (ENVSEC, funding from Finland - Kazakhstan, EADB – Tajikistan) as well as co-funding from the IWRM related activities implemented by UNDP at national level.

Risks

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact & Probability	Countermeasures / Mngt response	Owner	Status
Identified in the application							
1	**Implementation Arrangements** NWCs or PIUs are not formed & adequately staffed	May 2008	Political/ Organizational	IWRM governance and institutional reforms, efficient and effective project management and organizational capacity building will be limited. Probability 2, Impact 4	During the first six months, this issue will be monitored by the PTL, and alternatives developed to be agreed upon by the PB, as needed.	PTL / PB	*App PIUs in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan are staffed with key personnel*
2	**Implementation Arrangements** Local organizations do not have/appoint suitable dedicated permanent staff.	May 2008	Organizational	IWRM governance and institutional reforms and organizational capacity building will be limited. Probability 3, Impact 3	During the first six months consultants will assist PIUs to identify local-level organizations and make suitable staffing arrangements for UNDP approval.	National govts.	*Resolved in all countries – Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.*
3	**Stakeholder Relations** NWCs or PIUs do not encourage civil society and private sector participation	May 2008	Strategic	IWRM governance and institutional reforms and organizational capacity building will be limited. Probability 2, Impact 3	During the first six months consultants will assist PIUs to prepare stakeholder analyses and participation plans for UNDP approval.	PIUs	*Wide-audience inception workshops were held in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, so this risk should be limited.*
4	**Funding** Investment plans and/or pilot projects are not funded by donors	May 2008	Financial	IWRM processes and pilot projects are not scaled-up and there is no synergy with other donors programs. Probability 2, Impact 3	DCGs will advise the PTL/PIUs and/or NWCs. Investment plans and pilot projects prepared to donor requirements, or for parallel funding if necessary.	PB / Assurance	*on-going*

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact & Probability	Countermeasures / Mngt response	Owner	Status
Identified at the inception stage							
5	**Sufficient Co-funding** Additional co-financing for the project is not secured	August 2009	Financial / Reputational	Final confirmation on Norwegian co-financing (considered as the main co-funding partner) is pending or re-considered. Probability 2, Impact 3	PTL and PIUs will be identifying additional funding sources and ensuring sufficient co-funding for the project during its implementation.	PTL/ PIUs	*on-going*
6	**Ongoing USD-EUR currency exchange rate fluctuations**	October 2009	Financial	Currency exchange rates may have impact on UNDP-EC agreement (in EUR) vis-à-vis financial reality in UNDP (USD) accounts	PTL and PIUs will identify additional financial sources / funding	PTL/ PIUs	*on-going*
7	**Transboundary agreements** Prepared agreements and institutional changes for IRBs are not agreed bilaterally on the transboundary level	October 2009	Political	Project activities on transboundary level are not fully agreed and adopted by the countries sharing IRBs	PTL and PIUs will be working in close cooperation with national governments and partners to ensure that all relevant concerns are taken into account and developed documents and arrangements are appropriate for the selected international river basins (IRBs).	National govts.	*pending*

Generally, identified risks do not imply any substantive changes to the project planning or arrangements, but they do require careful consideration and relevant management response.

Financial risks and transboundary risks, not in the hand of the project, seems to be underestimated.

Assumptions

In the Interim reports the Assumptions were one time updated (2012). It is interesting that the risk and assumptions are not integrated but in the design handled as separate aspects, not related to each other. As Assumption mostly include a risk it should have been better when assumptions and risks were closer connected. For example the fact that Norway had not confirm their funding was seen as a risk but the receiving of the funding was according to the overview not assumed however taken into account in the planning.

Assumptions of state ownership on financing were not all that realistic. Budget neutral approaches were not included in the project design but essential for state ownership.

Assumptions

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT "Promoting Integrated Water Resource Management and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia "		
	Intervention Logics	**Assumptions**
Overall objectives	The project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia through interventions at national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and at transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).	Political will and state support to the project operations; Political and economic stability - at least at the current level; Absence of major disasters in the region; Sufficient level of cooperation among CA countries - at least at the current level.
Specific objectives	The project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia through interventions at national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and at transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).	
	1. In **Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan** (Outputs 1 and 2) - to develop and implement integrated water resources management and water efficiency strategies/plans at national and basin level. Additionally - to develop sub-sector strategies/plans and demonstrate best IWRM practices in rural water supply and sanitation (RWSS), small hydropower (SHP) and irrigation efficiency through implementation of demonstration projects. Thirdly, to support IWRM implementation at water basin level, including in transboundary basins.	1. Governmental commitment to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to the demonstration projects implementation; 3. Available co-funding from state and regional budgets for project activities; 4. Sufficient cooperation and good will on transboundary level (for water basin IWRM).
	2. In the Ili-Balkhash River Basin (Output 3) - to foster transboundary dialogue and enhance cooperation between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China for improved management of the shared River Basin system and its resources.	1. Government commitment and sufficient mandate of Commission members; 2. Stakeholder commitment and active participation; 3. Follow-up on responsibilities regarding data collection, management as well as data sharing; 4. Interest and involvement of Chinese counterparts in policy level dialogues, info exchange and other collaborative actions.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT "Promoting Integrated Water Resource Management and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia "		
	Intervention Logics	**Assumptions**
	3. At a pan-regional level (Output 4) - to build regional capacity and provide adequate expert support to project processes and relevant regional institutions to ensure efficient and effective project implementation, pan-regional coordination of activities (in and outside the scope of this project), as well as policy advise and platform for IWRM dialogue at regional level, addressing climate change issues via IWRM tools and instruments.	1. Regional/governmental commitment to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to supporting regional activities; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on regional level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses at CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply etc.) to allow IWRM implementation; 5. Sufficient commitment and capacity of relevant regional institutions.
	The national / sectoral activities (**under outputs 1 & 2**) will aim at two sets of key results:	
Results	1. Realistic national targets, strategies, investment plans and financial policies, which will be informed by the results of demonstration projects (next result).	1. Governmental reforms do not endanger the functional responsibilities of state agencies/ministries; 2. Constant/predictable tax, tariff and pricing policies and regulations; 3. Political/economic situation is stable enough to plan funding, including external.
	2. Demonstration projects that inform practical management instruments and feasibility studies and can be scaled-up and replicated, based on available national, donor or private sector funding.	1. Governmental reforms do not endanger the functional responsibilities of regional/district/local authorities; 2. Constant/predictable tax, tariff and pricing policies and regulations; 3. External funding is available; 4. Regional/local capacities are enough to maintain improved infrastructure; 5. Maintenance/keeping costs are borne by local/regional budgets or investors; 6. Existing preconditions for replication - such as legal framework, financial means etc.
	Basin-level results (under outputs 1 & 2) are:	
	3. Development and implementation of: (i) a joint management arrangements – for equitable water, energy and O&M cost sharing – in Isfara transboundary sub-basin; (ii) context-specific participatory IWRM processes - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers; (iii) context-specific institutional reforms - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers.	1. Political will on both sides of the border; 2. Equitable economical and legislative rules in both countries for costs-sharing provisions; 3. Existing legal frameworks/possibilities on the national level; 4. Bilateral relations are at least at the current level of cooperation.
	In Ili-Balkhash basin (output 3):	
	4. Intensified bilateral cooperation activities and stakeholders engagement	1. Political will on both sides of the border; 2. Existing legal frameworks/possibilities on the national level; 3. Bilateral relations are at least at the current level of cooperation or improving; 4. Project experts and partners are actively involved in the process.
	5. Improved base for cooperation (such as provisions for the water-sharing agreement	1. Political will on both sides of the border; 2. Existing legal frameworks/possibilities on the national level;

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT "Promoting Integrated Water Resource Management and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia "		
	Intervention Logics	**Assumptions**
	and raised capacities of the Commission, basin authorities and stakeholders)	3. Bilateral relations are at least at the current level of cooperation or improving; 4. Stakeholders are actively involved in the process.
	At the regional level (**output 4**)	
	6. Improved capacities of national and sub-regional stakeholders in IWRM activities	1. Regional/governmental commitment to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to supporting regional activities; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on sub-regional level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses on CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply etc.) to allow IWRM implementation.
	7. Sub-regional dialogue on IWRM implementation and addressing climate change issues under IWRM frameworks	1. Regional/transboundary govt. commitments to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to supporting regional activities; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on sub-regional level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses and issues on CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply, climate change etc.) to allow IWRM implementation.
	8. Effective project management and implementation of project activities	1. Regional/governmental commitment to IWRM dialogue and activities, and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to coordination and cooperation on the regional level; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on the regional/transboundary level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses and issues on CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply, climate change etc.) to allow IWRM implementation.
Activities	***Key activities by results:*** *for more information, please, refer to the project work plan*	***Pre-conditions:***
output 1:	1.0. Support to IWRM implementation	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.
	1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Project	
	1.2. Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	
	1.3. Kyrgyz Rural Water Supply and Sanitation DemoProject	
	1.4: Small Transboundary Sub-basin management arrangements on river Isfara	
	1.5: Participatory Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) Processes	
	1.6: Other Priority Demonstration Projects	
	1.7: International River Basin Management (IRBM) Institutional Reforms	
output 2:	2.0. Support to IWRM development	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders;
	2.1 Irrigation pilot	
	2.2. Irrigation invest. Plans	

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT "Promoting Integrated Water Resource Management and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia "		
	Intervention Logics	**Assumptions**
	2.3. Rural WSS pilot	3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.
	2.4. RWWS Investment strategies, plans and financial policies	
	2.5. Tajik Small-Scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, plans & policies	
	2.6. Arrangements on management of the small transboundary sub-basin	
	2.7. Participatory International River Basin Management Processes	
	2.8. Other priority demonstration projects	
	2.9. International River Basin Management Institutional Support	
output 3:	3.1. Policy and inst. Analysis	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.
	3.2. Support to bilateral cooperation and joint activities	
	3.3. Support to operations of the bilateral commission and agreements	
	3.4. Coordinating water management activities in the basin, stakeholder engagement, contributing to IWRM on the national level	
output 4:	4.1. Overall Project Management and coordination	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.
	4.2. Regional Dialogue and Water Governance	
	4.3. Sector Capacity Building	
	4.4. Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms	

3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

Lessons from other relevant projects are limited incorporated into the project design or not revered to.

A number of lessons learned from previous water projects mentioned are:

- River Basin management needs to be done in combined approach of top-down and bottom up to gain results
- International cooperation can be built on bi-lateral basin cooperation
- The top down approach for the Aral basin showed limited successful
- Improved governance and sectoral service delivery are bottlenecks

A number of key lessons which could not be found in the project design or not fully worked out like:

- Importance of budget for implementation to root the project in the country
- Bi-lateral need for communication on similar level (especially Kazakhstan – China)
- Need for common transboundary basin implementation and working together
- Cooperation with countries as Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan is under estimated
- Working with agriculture is connected with the growing seasons. To reach an effective impact in agriculture at least 3 full growing seasons should be included
- Budget for project activities should be stable to enable optimization of the planning of their use

3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

Stakeholder participation was recognized as of major importance and widely incorporated in the project through workshops, meeting, information material, etc.

A wide range of target groups, stakeholders and beneficiaries has been identified in the design phase to be cooperated with. Awareness raising and capacity building are central approaches in the project.

3.1.5 Replication approach

Replication of lessons learned and future replication of project approaches is a central item in this project. At the same time the use of replication to spread the lessons learned is limited used by the description of the activities. As result replication was not fully implemented as tool. This was partly caused by the limited financial resources.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

The UNDP comparative advantages working transboundary and present in each country was globally identified in the project design. The existing national offices and networks of the UNDP are highlighted. Another advantage was the international status of the UNDP having easy access to international and bi-lateral partners.

The way this comparative advantage could be used to support the project implementation is not worked out.

The disadvantage of central offices resulting in a more centralized implementation instead of local one, necessary for the demonstration projects, was not recognized in the project design.

3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

In the design phase relationships between other interventions and the project are regular mentioned. It shows a complex of interventions on water related aspects. On the level of activities they are not highlighted again. An inventory of on-going projects was only established after the start of the project. Making use of the local capacity of the UNDP this could in draft have been done in an earlier stage speeding up the start of the project.

3.1.8 Management arrangements

The management arrangements included central management from Bratislava, with a team leader out-posted in Almaty, National coordinators in the capitals of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, and Almaty, and national experts group. On the basin level the coordination was done either on national level – Ili-Balkhas (Kazakhstan), Isfara – jointly Tajikistan & Kyrgyzstan & regional, or regional level – Chu-Talas basin. The joint transboundary basin coordination was weakly organised.

The project was guided by a central Project Steering Committee, which role was planned to be supported by the National Water Councils. To set them up in the involved countries was a longer process than expected.

The national coordinators were working under guidance of the designated staff of UNDP Country offices, which were also responsible for the basic budget control over the national components. It could be said that the national coordinators were two headed, mostly not a preferable management construction for adaptive management.

As result the transboundary basin coordination was limited and divided over two national country coordinators. This construction resulted in two national river basin management projects, with each their capacity building material, awareness, and cooperation model. The overall management, the half yearly meetings and common regional trainings could not prevent this.

The overall management of the budget has been done at the central level. The project document outlined the percentual distribution of funds to each of the components. This percentage has been slightly adjusted, depending on the work plans prepared for each project component.

Logframe was lacking flexibility and supporting instrumentation to be useful for an adaptive management process. And the project was forced to working under two partial management systems of the EU and the UNDP.

A project manual with responsibilities, tasks and procedures should have be welcomed.

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

As time has gone by since the first steps of the project design and acceptation a range of initiatives were taken by national, bi-lateral and International stakeholders. This caused regular need for adaptive management and cooperation with other projects and agencies.

Also the cooperation of the non-core countries (China, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan) were asking for creative management.

The lack of funding by the Government of Norway, changes in budgets were causing adaptive management. Also the changes in exchange rate between the EURO and USD were resulting in a loss of effective project budget of 150.000 USD which has to be compensated in the field.

The limitations in consistency between activities was corrected with the adding the umbrella sub-activities, confirmed with the Addendum to the Contract with EC. It should have been good when this was done in the inception phase.

In the core countries, due to the developments on IWRM process, regularly the input has to be adapted to the next phase of IWRM development for example the support to the State Coordination Council for water en energy issues and the Inter-ministerial Coordination Council for drinking water supply and sanitation in Tajikistan, and The National Water Council in Kyrgyzstan.

In Kazakhstan lack of capacity by the CWR caused additional input of the project on IRWM.

The project did not manage to raise the level of transboundary cooperation on the Ili-Balkhas basin to the expected level due to external causes. But the project succeeded in the practical re-confirmation of the water sharing agreement, initiation of discussions on it and technical works and capacity building activities.

Tensions on regional level between the countries created limitations on advancing the Pan regional IWRM dialogue. This has been compensated by capacity building, IWRM experience exchange and sub-regional cooperation like the national supported agreement of governors between the Batken region and the Sughd region. And the setup of a regional network for IWRM capacity building as flexible and informal process of cooperation between the countries.

In general it can be said that it was the national implementation of the project which brought the project to a higher plan, resulting in sustainability and ownership.

As mentioned before the project was lacking sufficient activities on Addressing Climate Change and Regional Integrated Water Resource management, which resulted at the end in an additional group of activities.

In the interim reports the project implementation has to be adapted regular.

A serious point is the lack of systematic evaluation of risks and assumptions in the interim reports. The narrative description "key issues and challenges" was part of the each report. The risk evaluation is however done in the internal management system of the UNDP, this was no major point in the project management structure as could be expected by an adaptive management process.

The unstable political situation in the southern regions delayed the demonstrations activities; a delay the project was able to overcome mainly by adapting the planning and intensified cooperation with third parties.

Thanks to creative management during the implementation, budgets were made free to enable some practical, recognisable and visible results, needed to stimulate the political process on water management and to compensate the lost budgets for investments.

By adaptive management the project managed to create satisfaction by the recipients, especially by creative management on national level.

Out-posting of the regional project coordinator from Bratislava to Almaty created a good basis for the transboundary coordination, in particular for management of the Chu-Talas project sub-component, as well as for providing substantive support to the national project coordinators in implementation of national activities. The regional project coordinator did however not manage the lacking cooperation between nation offices like on the Isfara basin.

3.2.2 Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

Partnership arrangements have been formed on different levels. As many national, bilateral and international organisations were active on integrated water management, creating a database for water management projects was of importance. This resulted in a network of cooperation on IWRM. The value of this network support cannot be underestimated.

On international level intensive cooperation was also brought from the ground with a range of international stakeholders and funding organisations. This was also done on basin level. For the Chu-Talas basin is intensive cooperated with UN ECE and OSCE, and for Isfara with GIZ and SDC (HELVETAS). Besides these there were regular contacts and consultations with a range of organisation in the region.

Cooperation with local and bi-lateral partners allowed a raise of sustainability of project activities like the cooperation with HELVETAS in the setup and continuation of the Isfara river basin allowing

to extend the project over more than one growing season and in this way making it effective, or with SDC in the replication of automatic water monitoring reducing the cost and increasing the efficiency.

There is a number of IWRM related projects that are implemented by UNDP Country offices as well as funded by other donors, which have confirmed co-funding to the present project. Several additional consultations were made by the Project Manager with the World Bank and HELVETAS on further possibilities of funding the present project. Due to lack of timely formal requests to the World Bank and HELVETAS, both prepared for co-funding, chances on co-funding were not used. But replication of each other's experience and useful complementarity to each other's input was not hindered by this.

The project managed very well to include local / national key stakeholders with sustainable results. Good examples can be found in all three countries.

On local level network building worked out well. Kazhydromet and other local stakeholders access to data and information analysis capacity was increased, allowing them to improve prognoses. Involving them in the Ili-Balkhash River Basin Council enabled them to communicate information and prognoses with their end information users, something which was not possible last 20 years by lack of access and capacity. The tools developed are ready for replication elsewhere and the institutions prepared to participate. Similar examples can be found in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. It is interesting to see that local stakeholders are starting to replicate their experience themselves.

Regional authorities, local authorities and local stakeholders of the pilot areas participated active and willing to take up the ownership. This is clear by the interest in of farmers, their increase in crop, and water efficiency, willing and interested to participate in or to set up new WUAs, the preparedness of villagers to participate in the financing of the RWSS. Also the active involvement of stakeholders and their proactive actions in the Ili-Balkhash basin is proofing this.

3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

The monitoring of the project was not carried out according to the project documents and FAFA. In the FAFA is described that the EU will participate in the UNDP monitoring and evaluation of the project.

In practice the project was monitored by the EU according to EU standards. As the management system of the EU and UNDP have different characteristics and orientation this placed the EU monitors for the bottleneck to monitor by EU standards but not having the standard EU instrumentation like the output performance report available. Also the lack of an integrated overview of risks and assumptions in the reporting did not ease the monitoring. This is clearly visible in the first EU monitoring report. The validation of the project was further decreased by the slow start of the project.

In the second and third monitoring report the approach was less on indicators and more on sustainable result and resource use. This increased the score of the project and delivered better recommendations.

In practice the project was monitored by the EU according to EU standards. As the management system of the EU and UNDP have different characteristics and orientation this placed the EU monitors for the bottleneck to monitor by EU standards but not having the standard EU instrumentation like the output performance report available. Also the lack of an integrated overview of risks and assumptions in the reporting did not ease the monitoring. This is clearly visible in the first EU monitoring report. The validation of the project was further decreased by the slow start of the project.

In the second and third monitoring report the approach was less on indicators and more on sustainable result and resource use. This increased the score of the project and delivered better recommendations.

Major recommendations were:

- Improved details on the progress to enable assessment of the performance and use of the Logframe and surrounding system – not implemented
- Securing of funding – taken up
- In time reporting to secure the EU instalments - improved
- More information in Russian language about project planning - unknown
- Preventing duplication in the project and with third parties – partly improved
- Framework for capacity building on national ministerial and regional level and facilitating the regional dialogue - implemented
- Increase donor coordination - implemented
- Increase of EU visibility – limited implemented
- Pan regional dialogue is focussing too much on technical level instead of agreements – not realistic
- More attention to social impact of the projects implementation - implemented

The recommendations from the monitoring were mainly taken into account by the project, commented and follow up given. This does not count for the recommendations on the management and information system squeezed between the EU and UNDP.

To prevent double monitoring the UNDP mid-term monitoring was cancelled, as the EU monitoring missions were carried out in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

3.2.4 Project Finance

The project was financed by different sources, in different currency and in cash and in-kind. Not all co-financing was fully agreed in advance, which caused an instable financial position.

The project is funded in EURO and USD. Especially the changing exchange rate between the USD and EURO caused a loss in project budget the EU was a major funder of the project. This caused a loss of almost 150.000 USD which could not be compensated in any other way.

This has put stress on the project as all the agreed activities had to be carried out. Not enough budget was set aside to buffer these potential losses, and some activities had to be cancelled to adapt to the impact of the exchange rate. This resulted for example for Kyrgyzstan the cancellation of the agreed second phase of the pilot project in Isfara basin.

Another major change in the project funding was the loss of expected funding by the Norway government of 800.000 USD. This funding was promised based on project proposals and taking into account by the project design. This budget was not in written confirmed by Norwegian government. Due to policy change the proposed projects were not granted, which reduced the budget for local practical implementation of the project in e.g. the Isfara basin, reducing the input mainly to inventory, planning, capacity building and demonstration activities. The activities were not adapted in time, waiting for other funding. Improved high level communication with Norway could have prevented this uncertainty in earlier stage.

USD 900.000 of the project budget was not covered by start. This seems to be not unusual by the UNDP to enable easy extension of the project. It showed that this budget was not taken into account by the plan of activities.

In a late stage the loss of Norwegian funding could for Kazakhstan partly be compensated by a 100,000 EUR funding of the Government of Finland, Additional funds from Finland in the amount of 254.700 USD were received via ENVSEC Additional 200.000 USD has been negotiated with EADB for activities in Tajikistan. Small cash co-financing was received through joint activities with UNDP CapNet, GEF IW:Learn project, UNESCO, Czech Trust Fund, etc.

It is pity that the project did not manage the cash co-funding of partners like the World Bank and SDC. The interpretation from their side is that it was due to the lack of formal request for cooperation. As mentioned earlier, the project manager had several consultations with the World Bank and HELVETAS on further possibilities of funding the present project. However, the proposals that have been presented to them within the Project activities could according to the team leader not be funded due to overlap with their initiatives. It is not clear where the responsibility for this was laying. The project cooperated intensively with example HELVETAS and OSCE in Kirgizstan, only this could not always be accounted as co-financing.

Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan agreed to co-finance in kind to an amount of $ 1.000.000. The way of accounting the co-financing in kind could not be found by this evaluation and also there was no clear methodology set up at the beginning of the project. The co-financing from the national governments was also not part of the "budget of the action" as per the Contract with EC.

Kazakhstan proposed under pressure of parliament not to co-finance in kind but to finance in cash. This was approved on different ministries. Pity enough the cash financing was hold up by the ministry of agriculture and could not been received in time. For 2013/2014 this budget might become available again for the Ili-Balkhas basin.

As the budgets were not received in advance, it was necessary to arrange a provision to intercept this. The so called budget override is the instrument for this. It looks like that this provision was not included to the right level in all country offices. It is advised that this is in future harmonised with the national offices in advance of the project implementation.

For investments co-financing was expected by the project design from the IFI. This assumption showed to be unrealistic as the term on the project did not coincide with the procedures of the IFIs, as they were not included in advance of the implementation. Budget size of IFI interaction (minimum 2-5 million USD) did not coincide with the budgets the project had foreseen neither had capacity to develop portfolio for this. Together with the lost Norwegian funding this left the project with little money for implementation and investments practical and technical improvements.

To raise effective investment money seed money attracting or stimulation national or donor budgets is essential. A minimum size of USD 100.000 is needed for direct implementations and investments. This budget was lacking in the project. Therefore it had been difficult to attract additional funding and to create more practical impact in the field.

Status of actual funding (as per Final report)

	Amount in USD	% of total
UNDP contribution	853,600	19.4%
Contribution from other IWRM related projects (other donors and UNDP implemented)	1,223,200	27.8%
Commission/EDF contribution	1,940,400	44.1%
Contribution(s) from other European Institutions / EU MS		
ENVSEC	255,200	5.8%
Finland	127,600	2.9%
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS	**4,400,000**	

3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)

By the project design the monitoring and evaluation was built around the ATLAS management system. This included quarterly reports, yearly interim reports (in the description of action call Annual Review report) and annual project reviews. In addition a Mid-term evaluation would be held and a final evaluation. The management system was completed by the Project Board – Regional Steering Committee

The monitoring and evaluation plan has been adjusted towards EU monitoring instead of EU participation in the UNDP monitoring, as the EU was the key donor of the project. This resulted in three EU monitoring missions, based on EU project management standards, but with a mainly UNDP management system.

For reasons of costs and effectiveness it was decided that the EU monitoring would replace the UNDP mid-term evaluation.

The terminal evaluation is carried out mainly under UNDP standards, however partly based on an EU Logframe.

Therefore this monitoring report is focussing more on sustainable results than in instrumental outputs. As the project is process oriented the sustainable results are more important than the outputs of the activities, mainly means in the process of IWRM development.

The Regional Steering Committee has been set-up with at the very beginning of the project and a ToR specifying the mandate and compositions of the committee has been agreed.

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

The cooperation between the UNDP and EU is fixed in the FAFA. This describes the relationship, responsibilities and management system between the organisations. In this case this mend that the project management structure of the UNDP has to be followed.

The EU requires measurable indicators for the activities to be financed. This was only partly the case in the UNDP Logframe. Therefore the EU required a Logframe in EU format. This was however only done during the inception phase and not, as could be expected, in the contracting phase.

It has been for management reasons better when not the EU Logframe was introduced parallel with the UNDP Logframe but when the UNDP Logframe has been made more measurable.

As the EU contribution was in EUROs and not in USD this included a risk for the active budget of the project. This risk is taken up in the risk assessment but not enough included in the management planning of the project. This resulted in late information of e.g. the Kyrgyz partner on the reduction in budget for basin demonstration.

The direct management lays according to the FAFA by the implementing agency in this case the UNDP. From the EU side distance management should take place.

In the project design intensive cooperation was planned with other agencies and institutions. This is also reflected in the project activities. However, too much was left over to the project implementation phase to agree on cooperation. It has been better when the potential cooperation in implementation and financing would have been discussed with the international partners in the preparation phase, to enable more intensive participation and not just cooperation and harmonisation.

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)

The project is process oriented and the outputs of the activities were oriented as instruments to gain sustainable results in the process of transboundary IWRM. This is requiring adaptive management. The main logframe was however more focussing on outputs.

As described in the guidance for terminal evaluation, a result is defined as a describable or measurable development change, resulting from a cause-and-effect relationship. This is asking for attention to the full chain of management. For this project this means from pan-regional level to local water access and efficiency.

The project was working on different levels of IWRM:

- Basin
- National
- Regional

The main effective level was the basin as there the effective water resource management could be decided. Here water efficiency, cost efficiency, water quality and water division comes together.

To do this effectively a national structure of efficient water use should be brought in place. For transboundary cooperation regional capacity building, exchange of experience and agreements are essential.

Basin level

On basin level good steps are set toward RBM.

The Ili-Balkhas River Basin is a good example of this, where all major stakeholders are active taking part in decision making and implementation.

In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan the demonstration project resulted in increased crops (20-35% increase in comparison with not included regions) and reduced water use (-30%) for the involved

WAUs. Also on water supply and sanitation progress has been made by community planning of water supply. Basic principles are agreed or re-confirmed and worked on. The progress of integration still needs some boost. As increasingly the national supporting system of IWRM is getting in place, there are good perspectives for basin development. By lack of budget not enough funds could be put in implementation and maintenance capacity. The agreement on cooperation between the Batken (KGZ) and Sughd region (TJK) is good basis for transboundary RBM.

The automation of the Chu-Talas water division works is a good step forwards for transparent water sharing. It should be good when Kazakhstan would also get direct access to the new information system.

National level

In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan especially, the project has catalysed the IWRM and RBM development strongly. With help of the project (and partners) sustainable results are gained on institutional, organisation and implementation level. Laws are rewritten or adapted. New laws and instruction adapted or under adaptation. Water cost principles are coming in place. Water user association settled. Weak point up to now is the capacity for practical maintenance by the WUAs and their financing.

On institutional level a leap forwards has been made, especially in Tajikistan.

For Kazakhstan the national level was only a small part of the project. The national re-organisation of the water management, just started to be integrated, is divided again over three ministries: agriculture for irrigation, environment for water resource management and transboundary cooperation and regional development for water supply and sanitation. The effective coordination of these responsibilities is still not clear.

On the other side the process of Green Economy started under the President is promising.

Pan-Regional level

Constrains between some countries had its impact on the regional level. Difficulties with corporation with Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan had its impact on the project results.

Also the limited progress by the transboundary cooperation with China reduced the impact. However here in the project design unrealistic assumption were made. As in China the ministry for Environment is responsible for transboundary water management, the essential equal partner from Kazakhstan was lacking. Efforts to link two different levels in Kazakhstan and China on policy level were not successful as experienced in the past by other initiatives. The reorganisation of the KAZ water management with the Min of Environment getting responsible for transboundary issues may be promising. On technical level the cooperation is going on due to the projects effort by the adaptation and improvements of the transboundary water division works. Also the training of KAZ national experts in water efficiency in China is a good signal. Indeed the sharing of water should be linked to water efficiency on both sides. In Kazakhstan there is much to improve in this field, as well on irrigation infrastructure as well as on farm level.

On bi-lateral level good examples are set for transboundary cooperation of IWRM in the Chu-Talas basin, Isfara basin and the Ili-Balkhas basin. The combined approach on national and (sub)basin level proofed to work as basis for pan-regional cooperation.

Looking at the objective of the project:

Foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia, through interventions at both the national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and transboundary level (mainly involving

Kazakhstan and China). The approach, starting from national and basin level, worked well. In relation to the pan-regional spin off, the strategy was not fully developed.

Lesson learned is that progress is not always made starting from international level but common on national level to solve the local/national problems. Bottom up processes are regularly building a stronger fundament for cooperation. This bottom up process is worth to be further supported. The common pan-regional bottlenecks which cannot be solved on national level can then be brought to the bi-lateral transboundary or international level.

It can be said that sustainable results are set on which can and will be built for future.

3.3.2 Relevance(*)

The project has been of full relevance for the region, especially to the projects core countries Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

It was fitting the UNDP country strategies and planning, but also increasingly fitting the national priorities. Integrated natural resource management and green economic development are becoming central issues in the countries policies.

Even more important it was fitting end user needs on different levels.

On Pan-regional level the relevance due to tensions between some countries is less. The risk was recognised in the design stage, and limited considered during the implementation. In the planning of activities, the project has always considered external participation and tension among the states (e.g. TAJ-UZB)

3.3.3 Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)

The project catalysed the IWRM on regional, national and basin level strongly. Especially taking into account the problems the project was facing in relation to budget and involvement of some countries.

After a slow start which resulted in 3-6 months delay in the project implementation, efforts were made to catch up again. After 9 months a basic team of national coordinators and international team leader was in place. This process should have been carried out much more efficient, in particular at national level.

This resulted in at least the loss of one-two growing seasons for the demonstration projects. The impact of the RBM demonstrations project in the Isfara basin is therefore someway reduced, considering also the financial constraints

For an effective implementation on agriculture and water use at a minimum 3 growing seasons are needed.

Seen the lack of data on indicators and the use of different logframes used (UNDP / EU) and indicators, and lack of final financial information, it is difficult to rate the overall efficiency. What is clear that after delay by the start sustainable results were gained (see sustainability) which are proofing effectiveness.

The communication with other donors led to cooperation with e.g. OSCE, GIZ and HELVETAS, with replication each other experience. Proof of giving wider spread of each other's materials could not been found.

The project had intensive cooperation and joint activities/events with other organizations, in particular UNESCO, CapNet, EUWI, and others.

On national level in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan and on basin level in Kazakhstan, the project was very effective in catalysing the institutional setting and in stakeholder involvement.

By working more on replication and sharing experience with other basins the effectiveness of the project could have been increased. This counts for example for the Isfara river basin management coordinated from two capitals, lacking coordination on the transboundary basin level with common activities as training, etc.

3.3.4 Country ownership

Tajikistan

The project catalysed IWRM in Tajikistan. Major steps forward were set and the overall institutional and legal setting is in place to proceed with the process on basin level, inclusive cost price oriented water resource management. Major bottlenecks are on local organisation level, information management and practical maintenance capacity (lack of investment funds).

The countries involvement was on top political and administrative level in this process. The project resulted in an inter-ministerial council on water issues, supporting laws, acts and strategies.

The country is now getting to a stage of local and regional implementation of the structures, already partly demonstrated in the Isfara pilot basin.

Kyrgyzstan

The project supported the strategy on water cost, awareness on climate change adaption, the institution structure for IWRM. Main institutional issues are decided, but by the implementation, information management and modelling still a lot to be done by the involved organisations, eager to do so. The project involved high level country officials. Lack of state budget and integrated decision making on (hydro) energy and water management are major bottlenecks still to be decided.

The practical management of water is an issue, divided over several levels of authorities.

However decided many years ago, now under support of the project the National Water Council will effective meet and is able to make decisions.

Kazakhstan

The countries ownership for Kazakhstan is unclear this moment. The recent reorganisation dividing water management again over three ministries is not promising. It is strongly depending on the role of the Ministry of Environment in water management will receive. It offers also a chance for a step forwards by basin and transboundary IWRM.

On the other side the process of Green Economy started under the President is promising for economy and Integrated Natural Resource Management. Ecosystem services, sustainable business sector development and Cost price development for natural resource are offering good perspectives for IWRM.

On Ili-Balkhaz basin level the ownership is very high under most of the involved stakeholders. The requests are now coming from the stakeholders instead from basin authorities. Also information supplying organisations like KazHydromet are strongly supporting the basin council as point of access for their information supply to end users.

Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan

The project did not raise the country ownership in these countries. On the other side the project was not well designed for intensive involvement of them.

China

The project has, as expected, hardly influence on the country ownership in China. For Kazakhstan good steps forward were made by reconfirmation of equal share, and implementation of improved transboundary water division work and putting the water efficiency on the map in Kazakhstan (under Chinese pressure).

Much more could not be expected. In the design phase the expectations were overestimated and not realistic, especially as China was not involved in the preparation phase and there were no equal partners on transboundary water management on both sides.

General

In general it has to be said that Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan took the ownership on national and is starting on regional level, Kazakhstan took the ownership on basin level.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming

The countries programme strategies are including water management. In the latest country programme plans (2010 – 2015) the importance of water has been further increased.

Water management is not only a natural resource management issue but directly related to other priorities as environmental protection, poverty alleviation, improved governance, natural risk prevention, and gender issues. In the project these were indirectly taken into account with water as tool.

Other points are proper management, crisis prevention and rehabilitation and partnership.

The demonstration projects are showing with increased yields (+ 20-30%) and water efficiency (+30%) an increase of potential profitability. Poverty alleviation in not only a matter of management, but also of access to markets and marketing, aspects which need further attention in the follow up.

The reduced water use by selected WUAs are allowing more WUAs to be receive the necessary water stock to raise the productivity in such and provide a larger group of farmers with the natural resources needed for creating an income.

The climate change adaptation study has contributed in a better preparation for natural disasters and awareness on the limitations of the water resources.

3.3.6 Sustainability (*)

The sustainability of the project varies with the countries involved. Unstable funding did not increase the sustainability of the project. The country results are listing a range of sustainable outputs.

The project played a catalytic role in especially Tajikistan to get IWRM from the ground, accepted, institutional and legal settle, capacity building needs recognised, inventory started up, first investment plans as example prepared and demonstration in the field being successful, ready to be replicated and scaled up.

Also in Kyrgyzstan good steps forward are made in this sphere. A good example is the National Water Council meeting this year for the first time and the setup of the Union of WUAs.

In Kazakhstan good progress is made on basin level, creating a functioning river basin council including all major stakeholders and getting accepted as decision maker on water management and activating local stakeholders on water management and rights.

On transboundary level sustainable steps forwards are less easy to recognize. On practical and technical level they are made, institutionally a lot has to be done yet.

With China no extended institutional cooperation could be build. One of the problems was the difference in level on both sides. Now the Ministry of environment of KZ will become fully in charge for transboundary cooperation this bottleneck is expected to ease. The technical agreement on improved transboundary water division works for two rivers and the recognition of a 50% share in water is a good step forwards. China pointing KAZ on their inefficient water use, was offering capacity building in this sphere.

The relation on the Isfara river basin between Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan is strongly improved expressed in an transboundary agreement of cooperation between the governors of the Batken and Sughd region. Also on practical field good steps forward are made. Transboundary most steps were set parallel on both sides of the border. A basin wide approach is needed to build on this fundament.

The automation of the transboundary water division works by Chumysh (Chu-Talas basin) is a good step in building trust and cooperation between KGZ and KAZ.

Financial sustainability is not reached yet for the countries involved. With defining cost of water for the user, the sustainability is increasing. However, still great investments in maintenance and measurement are to be made to reach a break-even point of income and cost. The Green Economic development in especially Tajikistan and Kazakhstan will contribute to the process of cost of environmental services. Approaches and strategies for financial sustainability are developing and under implementation.

The accumulating debts of water users and of water supply are not solved yet. Also the inventory of irrigation systems, an important step in rehabilitation and reforming the management, is besides for the demonstration projects, so far not done yet.

The reduced water use and increased productivity in the pilots are proofing the changes for sustainability.

Social-economic sustainability of water use has made a good step forward by activating WUAs and drinking water user associations and working on water efficiency. The fact that the water users are interested in organising them in water users group and associations is a clear proof of the process towards sustainability. In Kazakhstan, the Ili-Balkhaz basin was able to include all major stakeholders. Some major industrial stakeholder, first reluctant to participate, are now wanting to host the basin council meeting and to be able to present their efforts on improved water management. Information on water legislation and user rights resulted in a court case against regional authorities, proofing the involvement and understanding of local stakeholders.

Institutional sustainability has to be split in national and sub-basin level. In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan the project has accelerated the institutional development on IWRM. National water councils are set up, laws improved or brought in place, basic governance decided, methodologies developed, basic instruction and information material published, capacity building in progress.

On basin level the management structure is decided but maintenance is not effectively in place due to lack of equipment. In Kazakhstan the national situation is not clear with the present on-going reorganisation. On basin level the Ili-Balkhaz Basin Council is in place and its decisions are taken over by others for implementation.

The on-going activities are of support to the Environmental sustainability. Reduced water use, increased minimum ecological limits, and agreement on transboundary water sharing are increasing the ecological sustainability. Increasing water efficiency will strongly contribute to ecological improvement of river, lakes and soil quality.

Replication or potential for replication is also one of the approaches for sustainability. In the project design a too optimistic view was used on project extension and replication by third parties. To easy it was estimated that other project and state processes would take this up.

Two types of replication were recognized (with some examples):

- Replication of best practices in the region of other project
    - Kazakhstan RBM plans ARAL – CAREC
    - Kirgizstan
        - Swiss development agency - Automation of water works
        - Helvetas
            - Cooperation and capacity building of WUA
            - Installation of small equipment for water measuring
        - OSCE - Transboundary capacity building RBM
- Replication by others of project experience
    - Kazakhstan
        - KAZHYDROMET - River basin management support
    - Kirgizstan
        - OSCE - Transboundary cooperation
        - WB - Basin council support
    - Tajikistan
        - Inventory of water infrastructure as basis for water management by state organisations

In total the sustainability can be estimated as moderately likely.

3.3.7 Catalytic role

The project played a catalytic role on policy level, demonstration of IWRM, and replication. The project was scaling 'down' the national policies supported to basin level demonstrating the value of IWRM policy in the region. The need for capacity building is increasingly recognised, also the bottlenecks by it to overcome.

3.3.8 Impact

The institutional improvements are not reflecting directly in improved ecological status. Therefore the improvements should take place at wider scale. This is a process of awareness, capacity building, management and investment.

Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan having now the major national institutional structure in place or under implementation, the process for development can now move on to basin level and implementation. To implement RBM effective in the basins, the capacity for management (measuring, control and up-keeping) should be severely increased in a next phase.

To sustain the results also the water users should be more aware of water efficiency and the chances on increased crops. Most focus has been on water infrastructure but the biggest savings can be reached on the agricultural fields. In this way the results in the Isfara river with decreased water use of 30% in the involved WAUs is promising, especially as this is combined with increased productivity. There is principle agreement on equal sharing of water and on cooperation in basin water management.

The mechanisms for IWRM for these countries are getting in place, ready to be build up from bottom up as demonstrated by the project pilots.

The combination of institutional setting, economic improvement and raised income for the farmers seems to be an effective cocktail.

For Kazakhstan the institutional setting of the Ili-Balkhash Basin Council is build, accepted and raised involvement of all major stakeholders, also industrial. It proved it is activating public to use their rights and stakeholders to work on water improvement. The stakeholders are now pushing the meeting of the Basin Council and private stakeholders are prepared to co-finance the councils meetings. The lack of state funding is still a weak point as no permanent budget is assigned for it, yet. The follow up should be on basin council support, replication of the experience, water efficiency, improvement of water measuring and water cost, modelling and remote sensing as tools for effective water management. The Green economic development process started under the President is expected to offer good chances for improved resource management. Based on the modelling, scenarios should be developed on the consequences and economic loss of dropping water levels in the basin.

Water quantity measurements are slowly coming in place; water quality monitoring, an even more important ecological indicator, is still far away, on policy, transboundary and local level.

The basin plans and studies are given a clear view on the vulnerability of the (sub) basins.

No proof could be found of high public visibility of the project as recommended in the monitoring reports. This is in contrast with the visibility on institutional level.

4 Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

- Activities on pan-regional level based on demonstration of basin success stories, scenario development for climate change and capacity building.
- Management
    - A quicker start should be stimulated
    - Attracting staff in earliest stage and allowing application in Rus language and work on pre-selection of staff
    - Budget availability speeded up
    - Need for a local basin coordinator to allow transboundary RBM, instead of two national coordinators being responsible for half the basin
    - It is advised to strengthen in future the communication of the information collected in the Atlas system to the level of national coordinators, to allow them more to anticipate and adapt their planning in advance
    - A project manual with responsibilities, procedures and task is recommended
    - A more one headed management structure is recommended.
- Budget
    - More budget to enable basin management implementation capacity (investments)
    - To include IFI for project investments financing it is necessary to involve them in the design phase and not to wait till the implementation as the terms are regularly longer than the project duration
    - It is estimated that for a successful implementation of a pilot project per pilot / WUA there is a need of a budget of at least 25.000 USD for supplies, equipment, demonstrations, etc. For seed money attracting or stimulation national or donor budgets a minimum of 100.000 is needed for direct implementations and investments. This budget was lacking in the project. Therefore it was difficult to attract additional funding and to create more impact in the field. In combination with the budget gaps and uncertainties this reduced the momentum of the project.
    - To enable effective management and up-keeping of the water infrastructure, per region a budget of minimum USD 50.000 is needed for the necessary equipment. This mainly for hydraulic excavators.
    - Chances on co-funding were lost by lack of follow up. The procedures for this should be sharpended.
- Capacity building
    - Capacity building under service and information organisations like Hydromet should be raised, modern techniques for modelling and remote sensing included to allow besides data, information supply to the Basin authorities
    - More attention should be given to capacity building from bottom up in a complex approach to overcome the expected knowledge gap between young and old experts.

- RBM management
    - For effective management of the basin technical capacity should be supplied to practical management / maintenance of water
    - To root the RBM and to raise water efficiency more attention is needed in an bottom up approach to the land owners by demonstration farms focussing on water efficiency, crop choice, productivity and marketing
    - The IWRM should hook on by green economy development and focus more on economic aspects (potential profits and losses) of water and its management
    - The focus is mostly on external funding of water management. Instead more attention should be given to access to national funds and making use of legal rights.
    - Drinking water supply is a strong incentive for better water management, but it should be placed in the wider framework of IWRM.
    - WUAs can become a functional instrument towards improved water management under the condition that they are able to manage the water infrastructure and willing to function as a knowledge access point and intermediary for their members
    - There are doubts if the WUAs are large enough for efficient mechanisation. It is proposed to setup a federation of WUA as machine cooperation or as water way manager.
    - It proofed that it is not necessary to wait till the national framework for integrated water resource management is in place as many steps can be set on basin level.
    - The water supply and sanitation was not fully integrated in the project design. On the other side drinking water supply is an good incentive for self/co-financing and get acceptance for water cost compensation by the user. However this should be integrated clearly in RBM. A combined approach is needs for preparation of investment plan, preparation for local co-financing and practical improvement of water supply.
- Demonstration projects
    - For an effective agricultural pilot at least 3 full growing seasons should be included to allow effective spin off and replication.
    - With the equipment for maintenance of water ways a basis can be laid for sustainable economic development. With the equipment budget can be created to extend the capacity. Secondly the ownership of equipment allows as a potential pledge allowing for receiving credits for further extension.

4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

- In the project a first push is given to the effective working of Basin Committees. To follow up the initial benefits it is proposed to proceed with the support of the River basin committees, supplying them with a secretariat, water management capacity (measuring, controlling and practical up-keeping and repair works), water efficiency, integrated capacity building, awareness raising. Steps should be set towards ecological and chemical water quality control.
- Water efficiency and improved economic profits by better farm management is a key approach to institutional strengthening of IWRM, in a bottom up approach. This can be induced with demonstration farm / field development to show improved water efficiency in

combination with business planning and marketing for improved benefits. The WUAs can develop as the intermediary towards the farmers.

- Many international organisations are focussing on RBM in Central Asia (EBRD, WB, OSCE, GIZ, SDC, CAREC). Only some of them on transboundary RBM. Main approach is the top down one. Follow up of the project should focus on building RBM support from stakeholder's level, farmers, drinking water users, industry and urban areas.
- As little progress can be expected from a pan-regional approach further should be built on bi-lateral river sub-basin cooperation.
- As several organisation are focussing on basin management organisation the follow up should mainly focus on a bottom up approach of water efficiency, capacity building in water management and improved crop rotations (ecological and economical). Also modelling and scenario development in combination with remote sensing and sensor techniques should be supported to bring water management to a higher level on the level of policy, management and land use.
- There is a need to extend the results by replication to other sub-basins and other countries.
- Further capacity building in legal rights, responsibilities and access to national/regional funds and (financial) markets is proposed.
- Awareness raising and preparedness on private local financing to stimulated large scale investments by external parties (up to 30% is realistic)
- Support of WUAs and FWUAs in transparency and management. More important is to help them with their financing structure, the basis for IWRM. Also their institutional setting should be strengthened, including transparent tax regulations.
- Support should be given for fine-tuning the legislation in favour of practical management
- Budget neutral approaches for IWRM

4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Future directions of project development underlining the main objectives and projects result is proposed to be composed out of the following issues:

- Basin council support
- Water efficiency of irrigation system and farm level
- Demonstration of farm productivity, crop choice and marketing
- Increase of management capacity by measuring water, controlling water and un-keeping of the infrastructure.
- Water cost payment development
- Assess the Economic benefits of IWRM and development of scenarios about the impact of tendencies on longer term to national and farm level to raise support
- Stimulate budget neutral approaches
- Increase the capacity for information supply by service organisation like Hydromet
- Integrated capacity building programme on water management from policy level to implementation, from universities to management training

- As international organisation are increasingly focussing on basin management the UNDP is advised to focus on WAU level in an process from bottom up support for RBM

The support to RBM should focus on the Basin Councils as platform for users and policy. The focus should be on support of secretariat support (temporary) financial support and state and water user financing mechanisms. The willingness of other organisations to implement the Basin Council decisions should be strengthened and the replication of the experience to other basins by involving them and giving them basic support to start.

In parallel for bottlenecks in legislation in relation to practical implementation proposals should be developed and support raised.

The water loss in the irrigation infrastructure is estimated on 25-50%. The loss on field level however is estimated at 50-65%. With little support it was possible to reduce the water needs of the involved WUA with 30%. This means that by water efficiency the focus should be even more on field level than on irrigation infrastructure as the best returns are expected on field level.

Water efficiency has not only to do with type of water use but also with crop choice, available equipment and marketing.

It is proposed to support or set up demonstration farms and in extension demonstration field by the WUA to show the profits which can be gained out of improved management, crop rotation and marketing. This last component is essential because out of these profits the integrated water management has to be financed. More income means better chances for water cost financing.

Capacity building is a matter of saving of existing knowledge, bringing in new knowledge, techniques and experience, and giving future experts a chance to excel and to entrance the market. The first aspect is the most sensitive are the key experts and management are getting closer to the age of pension.

Fields of extension are GIS, remote sensing and sensor techniques, modelling, scenario development, integrated natural resource management, technical expertise development and information supply to end-users.

To allow capacity building and market inflow and flow-through of the students and young professionals, there is need for extension of their capacities on practical technical and management level. This can be done by participation in international programmes, creating trainee places and internships, international exchange and master programme, participation of young professional experts to get professional training in participate in UNESCO centres of excellence on remote sensing (ITC), water management (IHE) and related fields.

From them studying abroad several are not returning to their country to raise the national professional level. A guarantee or trainee system by successful education for a job could be an incentive (adoption of students of excellence).

Capacity of senior key experts should be used to train junior experts in the field by the executions of projects. Capacity of senior and international experts will be used for workshops and seminars. Senior experts will also be used for influence policy.

For senior managers exchanges are a useful instrument or workshops on integrated trans-sectoral scenario development with scenarios with as result solving some of the basin problems by cooperation.

The basin managers are lacking information on their basins to build on effective management. Therefore capacity should be extended by information supplying organisation like Hydromet to work with new techniques like remote sensing and modelling to shift from data to basin information supply.

To allow these inventories, data collection and modelling should be extended towards water stock, water management infrastructure and works, basin contours, etc.

To extent the impact of the basin management demonstration project it is advised to include in the basin management for replication of experience a second nearby sub-basin, for KGZ / TJK the Aksuu basin for example.

4.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

The experience in the Isfara basin shows that river basin management does not have to wait till all national instrumentation is in place, as many steps ready for replication can be set on basin level.

Pan regional cooperation best building on sharing experience and capacity building than on pushing to cooperation

A project should be visible and recognisable to have impact on policy and strategy.

Cooperation is based on win-win situation.

To bring water management to a higher level the value of water has to be translated into economic value or risk of loss of economic value.

Cooperation is based on ability to measure, control and manage. Lack of one of them will reduce the trust.

5 Prospectives:

Building on the proposals for future directions, prospectives for future IWRM can be formulated.

Seen the activities of other international organisation the focus should be on eight directions:

1. Bottom up by improving water efficiency and profitability for farmers by demonstration farms and fields and consultancy
2. WUA transparency and ability for practical management and maintenance of water inclusive investment and equipment management support
3. Transboundary RBM cooperation and support of basin councils
4. Knowledge transfer, knowledge inflow and capacity building in water management structure
5. Extension of the capacity of service organisation as Hydromet towards information management instead of data supply towards end-users (remote sensing, sensor technologies, modelling, scenario development). Also the capacity to review natural resources use as an economic source should be strengthened in the direction of economic scenario development to show the risks and chances for water related economy.
6. Development of supporting legislation and budget neutral strategies needed for basin management
7. Hooking on to the process of Green Economic development
8. On Pan regional level sharing national experience

Main countries to focus on are Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, with the option to include Uzbekistan based on transboundary nature protection.

More attention should be given to public communication and awareness raising on principles, low cost techniques and win-win situations and economic impact as tool for public support.

For each country there are specific aspects to be highlighted.

5.1 Tajikistan

Cooperation is based on trust and possibility to implement and the options for control. As Tajikistan made a big jump forwards on the institutional setting of integrated water management catalysed by the UNDP/EU project.

Basic knowledge is build in the Isfara basin resulting in a reduction of water use with approx. 30 % and a crop increase from 1,9 to 2,4 ton/ha and an additional sustainable supply to 2500 ha of farmland under lead of WUA, now a new step has to be set towards implementation.

Besides WUAs, the Federation of WUAs is under the new legislation taking over the tasks of the Rayon Water Management and so water users pushing to finance the water management.

As the EBRD is focusing on investment in infrastructure, GIZ on local RBM, CAREC on conflict resolution, the management of the canals, support to the bottom up should be organized, efficient water use by farmer stimulated, crop management support (including marketing) organized, and the practical management of the water canals and irrigation ditches, not being the main canals under the ministry of water management.

5.2 Kyrgyzstan

Kyrgyzstan is as Tajikistan faced with lack of information supply, water management and water efficiency and future water management capacity. However the organizational structure, with state, oblast, region and WUA managing the irrigation system, is different the approach is mostly the same only it is more difficult to identify who should manage effectively the irrigation system and is in need of equipment.

5.3 Kazakhstan

Kazakhstan is ahead with Basin management at least on paper. Indeed for the Balkhaz basin there is now a functioning Basin council with very active participation of population and water users. Stakeholders are starting to use the Water Code, big firms are starting to improve their water use. The sustainable financing is still to be organized. The split up of water management under 3 ministries is a new disadvantage, however for transboundary cooperation with China it might be an advantage as now both countries are represented on the same level.

China is improving their transboundary water division works and offering training on water efficiency.

There are good changes for settlement of integrated water resource management under the flag of Green Economy under the president and development of agriculture.

The Balkhaz lake is drying out, caused by limited inflow by China and inefficient water use in the basin. Estimated loss in the main canals is expected to be at least 50%, on WUA / farm level the water loss is expected to be between 60 and 70 %. Scenario development on economic loss based on reduced water levels can induce national support, when brought to high enough level like the Security Council of the President.

Hydromet has now a decent and verified historical database on water quality and quantity. A basic GIS capacity is settled. They found their way to their clients by basin information supply through the basin council with prognoses and basin water processes. Next step would be improved monitoring of WUA irrigation canals, water quality control in combination with modelling to allow decent prognoses for the basin and long term information supply to water uses. Also remote sensing is under developed.

Like in the other counties also in Kazakhstan the management and experts are around the 60th risking the knowledge transfer to future experts and management.

Under the president strong input is made for green economy development, including improved use of resources like water and land. For example exponential water cost and water quota are discussed. These are offering a good base for sustainable development. However it will be needed to place the water management on presidential level. The reduction in water level of the Balkhaz water reservoir is resulting in reduced possibilities for irrigated agriculture. Modelling this effect and translating it to economic loss and related to the new policy of green economy will allow to get it on the level of the Presidential Security Council.

It is clear that Kazakhstan is wealthier than Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. The options to apply for governmental support are mainly unknown in the region. This is blocking the support of facilities to the basin.

5.4 Uzbekistan

As Uzbekistan is the most open for transboundary water management, alternative gates for cooperation have to be found. One of the options which seems to work is transboundary nature protection as basis for integrated basin management.

It is proposed to searched for a sub-basin with high natural values with chances for nature protected area development on both Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

Cooperation is proposed with CAREC in this field.

5.5 China

For China cooperation should be sought on water efficiency, information sharing and technical cooperation. On national level the ministry of Environment should be supported to contact the ministries in China responsible for water management. Support can be asked from China on capacity building on water efficiency.

5.6 Project directions:

1. Bottom up by improving water efficiency and profitability for farmers by demonstration farms and fields and consultancy (TJK / KGZ/ KAZ)
    a. As water efficiency can be ruled on basin level by max. 20-50 % on farm level this is 50-70%. Therefore it is proposed to concentrate on
        i. Farm land irrigation efficiency
        ii. Crop selection
        iii. Demonstration farm support / development
            1. Research on crops, marketing, field irrigation
            2. Demonstration on the demonstration farm
            3. Satellite demonstration fields in the WUAs
            4. Setting up information service
            5. Business plan development
            6. Enabling FWUA as information point
    b. For investments in water efficiency investments are needed in equipment for maintenance. Therefore capital inflow is needed in the form of grants, credits. As it cannot be expected that IFIs will jump in during the project implementation to finance the necessary investments, there is a necessity for their early involvement in be organised in the design and preparation stage and alternative constructions should be applied including:
        i. Credit facilities for FWAU / WUA / farmers agreed in advance with financing organisations (in case of needs of 1 – 5 mill.USD
        ii. Seed money in the project for investments (200.000 – 400.000 eur)
            1. Hydro post improvement
            2. Improvement water quality
        iii. Small investment budget as example for improved water management equipment (> 25.000 euro/ WUA or 200.000 eur / FWUA)
            1. Local water management implementation actions
        iv. From region 30% can be asked for local implementation (20% admin, 10% community)
    c. Direct results should be experienced on local level
        i. Water quality (drinking water)
        ii. Energy
        iii. Water quantities
        iv. Budget savings

2. WUA transparency and ability for practical management and maintenance of water inclusive investment and equipment management support (TJK / KGZ / KAZ)
    a. Support WUA should be given on Knowledge, Promotion, Transparency, Measuring equipment and maintenance of water infrastructure
    b. As the WUA are too small for effective mechanic management of waterways, this task is assigned to the Federations of Water users working on sub-basin level (TJK). The FWUAs should be supplied with hydraulic excavators (at least 1 small one and 1 large one (cost estimated on 150.000 usd) for each FWUA. Contracting the work for the members against real cost (incl. reservation for new buy) will allow them to become economic sustainable. This will allow them to get credit for further investments. Maintenance Service facilities will be supplied by the RayVodKhoz. Training of maintenance and break down prevention of equipment necessary and Business plan development and transparency of cost

3. Transboundary RBM cooperation and support of basin councils. The following basins are proposed to build on the present experience, network and ownership and to get decent examples. It is essential that one person per basin is responsible for the transboundary basin coordination and cooperation. This may be of year under one national coordinator other year under other one.
    a. Basin selection
        i. Ili-Balkhaz – (KAZ-China) with involvement for replication of other basin(s)
            1. Good option now transboundary management under min ecol.
            2. Extension on effective water sharing, capacity building and communication/information exchange
            3. Basin council secretariat support
            4. Demonstration of maintenance, crop selection, water efficiency, productivity, profitability and water quality
            5. Support on Water management:
            6. Hydraulic modelling the basin, Economic modelling of reduced water levels in the Balkhash reservoir, Regional information meetings on water management, problems, savings and legislation. Bringing the transboundary water management to the level of the ministry of environment. Cross-boundary training on water efficiency (in China)
            7. Fund raising: On several levels training on options and in application for governmental funds on agriculture and environment is necessary: Oblast level, Regional administration, Water users
            8. Farm consultancy programme development for spreading experience
        ii. UZB-KAZ – nature protection based cooperation combined water management project
        iii. Isfara sub-basin for cooperation KGZ/TAJ with a replication basin e.g. Aksuu
            1. Demonstration of maintenance, crop selection, water efficiency, productivity, profitability and water quality possibly extended with drinking water supply
            2. Investment and support in maintenance
            3. Basin FWUA support by practical maintenance and functioning (TJK) and of water authorities in KGZ.
        iv. Chu-Talas basin (KAZ/KGZ)
            4. Support on items of information management, planning and forecasting
                a. GIS support, Basin plan, Modelling, Remote sensing and exchange of information

b. Support to River Basin Council needed for secretariat, Stakeholder involvement, Transboundary (with OSCE), Basin understanding, Cooperation Basin Council / WUAs, Capacity building and cooperation with information suppliers and authorities
c. Cooperation with major international institutions
    i. As the WB is planning a 4 years 8 million project on RB Council support for KGZ, close cooperation with them is needed
        5. Support will be on 3 levels: National - Water department and Union of WUA, Regional - RB Councils, Local WUA - On administrative level and Capacity building
        6. No transboundary support is planned so a chance for UNDP to extend transboundary communication
    ii. Cooperation with OSCE support for transboundary RBM and councils (KGZ / TJK)
    iii. Water infrastructure to be financed by the EBRD / GIZ (TJK)
    iv. Basin management and communication by GIZ (TJK)
    v. Conflict resolution by CAREC (TJK / KGZ / KAZ)
d. Basic introduction on water quality (chemical and ecological)

4. Knowledge transfer, knowledge inflow and capacity building in water management structure

    a. Management staff and key experts are aging and new technologies needed to reduce cost of data collection and students from the university are lacking practical experience (TJK / KGZ / KAZ). Approaches proposed are:
        i. Transfer of knowledge of older key experts to juniors. Junior expert places should be created in the project to be guided by senior experts.
        ii. Lacking middle staff – training in the fields
        iii. Entrance of young staff

            A lot of students are not returning to the country after studying abroad. Facilities should be included to stimulate young experts to return and use their knowledge in their own country. Trainee places and junior expert places should be included in future projects. This can be realised through international education programmes (EU and others), Trainee places, External professional education UNESCO (ITC / IHE) in combination with reserved labour places in the institutions.
        iv. Especially for Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan women are coming increasingly in management and expert roles as men are working outside the country. This is causing an adapted need for capacity building

5. Extension of the capacity of service organisation as Hydromet towards information management instead of data supply towards end-users (remote sensing, sensor technologies, modelling, scenario development). Also the capacity to review natural resources use as an economic source should be strengthened in the direction of economic scenario development to show the risks and chances for water related economy. Also closer links should be laid between meteorological data to hydraulic data

    a. GIS support
        i. Calibration and automation of hydro posts
        ii. Inventory of basins
            1. Contour map development
            2. Remote sensing and sensor techniques

                New remote sensing and sensor technologies are a good incentive to progress with challenging management. They ease the collection of necessary data and in combination with modelling and scenario development this information stimulates wise decision making on water management. Multi regression analysis is a major instrument

for analysis of tendencies. Information needed are Water stock, Bio-productivity, Soil humidity, Soil fertility

iii. Modelling of basin
iv. Climate change impact and adaptation
v. Scenario development (technical and economic)

6. Development of supporting structures, legislation and budget neutral strategies needed for basin management
    a. Support to the Union of WUA (KGZ)
        i. Instrument to stimulate basin councils and for local capacity building, and as tool for communication with national authorities
7. Hooking on to the process of Green Economic development
    a. In all three countries the process of green economy is in development. This offers good opportunity for sustainable water resource management, water validation and cost financing. It is needed to transfer water as natural resource in an economic resource with chances of profits and risk for losses
8. On Pan regional level sharing national experience
    a. Communication support
        ii. Inter-regional – basin wide
        iii. National – regional - basin
            1. To grow the awareness of common win-win situations
            2. The need for common information – institutional and technical
            3. Linking strategies and implementations

6 Summary

On country level the project catalysed in cooperation with other international funders Integrated Water Resource Management Kyrgyzstan and especially in Tajikistan, and on Ili-Balkhas basin level in Kazakhstan.

The demonstrations in the pilot basins showing sustainable success with reduced water use and increased yields.

Service and information supplying organisations are interested to bring their service to a higher level by modelling and scenario development, based on GIS development, remote sensing and sensor technologies. Also their interest is raised in information supply instead of data supply to the end users.

Climate change adaption is catching increasing interest and a stimulant for IWRM. Scenario development on climate change adaption will be an important tool for improvement as proofed in the project.

Where in this project the input was mainly on national level and national basin demonstrations, this has to be extended towards transboundary basin implementation.

Transboundary sub-basin approach showed to be an effective way to stimulated transboundary cooperation, a way that should be proceeded and replicated to other sub-basins.

Good chances are to root it on Green Economic development, which is starting or on-going in each of the countries.

As main water savings can be reached on farm and field level the focus should shift towards demonstration of farm water efficiency and productivity. Demonstration on regional level on demonstration farms in combination with field level on WUA level will be effective. This has to include water efficiency, productivity, crop rotation, marketing and business planning.

It has been a mis-assumption that the IFI would jump during the project on the implementation financing needed investment. Therefore the procedures of them are too long.

Also the slow start of the project has been reducing the impact, especially by the demonstration projects, as it strongly reduced the number of growing seasons involved as the possibility to demonstrate success and replicate.

On pan-regional level the project was less successful, but this was also a problem in the design of the project focussing mainly on basin and transboundary level.

The countries (for Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan) or the basin (Kazakhstan) took the ownership of the project.

However financial sustainability could not be reached in this phase a good basis has been built for it, involving stakeholders also from bottom up and improving the national structures. The financial sustainability is hindered by lack of investments in practical water management and water cost financing system which is not in place yet.

In a next phase economic scenario development on basin tendencies should get more attention to hook on to the process of Green Economic development. This count also for risk management.

The ecological impact cannot be registered on such short term. The monitoring is not fully in place and scale is too small. But decreased water use is a major indicator for improved ecological improvement.

In future the project should be designed more on received funding than on expected funding. Exchange rate losses should be foreseen in the planning stage of the project and not during the implementation. It is easier to add or extend activities than to reduce them.

Chances to step by step intensify the cooperation between Kazakhstan and China are present and should be built on. This counts also for the cooperation with Uzbekistan where chances exist for water management with nature protection as base.

In cooperation with partners like the EU one single management system should be used, measurable but flexible enough to apply an adaptive development process.

The project has been relevant, significant, not most efficient, but with sustainable impacts, where country ownership is taken on national or basin level, by government or local stakeholders. The project played the catalytic role which was expected.

Budget neutral approaches have to be stimulated to overcome bottlenecks with financial sustainability.

7 Annexes

Annex A ToR

EU-UNDP Project: Promoting Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for independent terminal evaluation of the project

Type of Contract:	Contract for Services of an Individual Contractor
Languages Required:	English, Russian
Duration:	December 2012 – February 2013 (estimated 32 working days)
Location:	Home based with mission(s) to Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan / Bratislava
Payment schedule:	**-** First payment: 25% of the total contract upon acceptance of the workplan for in country mission by UNDP Project Manager; - Second payment 50% of the total contract upon submission and acceptance of the draft Evaluation Report and acceptance by the UNDP Project Manager - Final payment: 25% of the total contract upon submission and acceptance of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report
Application Deadline:	20 November 2012

Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.

1. BACKGROUND

This Terminal Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Regional Center for Europe and CIS (Bratislava) as the coordinator of the EU-UNDP project. The objective of the evaluation is to review and assess the Project results, its efficiency, stakeholder involvement, sustainability and to provide a view on the follow-up initiatives related to IWRM in the Central Asia.

Project description

Objectives

The project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue, in Central Asia, through interventions at national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and at transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).

Target Groups

Kyrgyzstan: Oblast and Rayon DWRs, jointly with WUAs and NGO support; Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic on the Use of Water Management Facilities of Intergovernmental Status on the Rivers Chu and Talas, MAWR, MWRI and local authorities, with key stakeholder involvement, and assisted by NGOs; Village CBOs with DWS and DSE and NGO support;

Tajikistan: Oblast and Rayon OMAs, jointly with WUAs and NGO support; MWRI, MoA, MEI and local authorities, with key stakeholder involvement, and assisted by NGOs; Village CBOs with OMA and/or SUE, and NGO support;

In selected transboundary pilot areas: Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and preferably also Uzbek authorities; NGOs and other stakeholders

Kazakhstan: Water Resources Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of RK; Ministry of Environmental Protection; Joint Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and People's Republic of China for the Ili-Balkash River Basin; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization; Kazakhstan Meteorological Service (Kazgidromet).

Expected results

In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, the project will support the governments to develop and implement national integrated water resources management and water efficiency strategies (IWRM Strategies) at national and basin level. In doing this, the project will focus on concrete interventions to improve: irrigated agriculture, rural water supply and sanitation, and small-scale hydropower service delivery, under the umbrella of IWRM governance and institutional reform.

In the Ili-Balkash River Basin, the project will support the Kazakh government to foster transboundary dialogue and enhance cooperation with the People's Republic of China for improved management of the shared River Basin system and its resources.

In the Chu-Talas River Basin the project will support both governments to integrate climate change adaptation activities in their operation, and to improve capacities to deal with transboundary water resources allocation and safety.

On a regional level, the project will ensure efficient and effective implementation and coordination of all activities, knowledge exchange as well as pan-regional coordination and capacity building.

Main activities

Output 1: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Kyrgyzstan

1.0. Support to IWRM implementation

1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Projects

1.2 Kyrgyz Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies

1.3 Kyrgyz RWSS Demonstration Project

1.4 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management (Kyr-part)

1.5 Participatory IRBM Processes (Kyr-part)

1.6 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Kyr-part)

1.7 IRBM Institutional Reforms (Kyr-part)

Output 2: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Tajikistan

2.0 Support to IWRM development

2.1 Tajik Irrigation Demonstration Projects

2.2 Tajik Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies

2.3 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Demonstration Project

2.4 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies

2.5 Tajik Small-scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies

2.6 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management (Taj-part)

2.7 Participatory International River Basin Management Processes (Taj-part)

2.8 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Taj-part)

2.9 International River Basin Management Institutional Support (Taj-part)

Output 3: Transboundary Dialogue and Cooperation in the Ili-Balkhash River Basin

3.1. Policy and Institutional Analysis

3.2. Support to Bilateral Cooperation and Joint Activities

3.3. Support to bilateral commission and framework agreements

3.4. Coordinating Water Management Activities in the Basin, Stakeholder Engagement

Output 4: Regional Dialogue, IWRM Governance and Sector Capacity Building

4.1 Project Management and Coordination

4.2. Regional IWRM Dialogue and Water Governance

4.3. Sector Capacity Building

4.4. Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms

More information can be found at the project website: http://centralasia.iwlearn.org/

2. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

This evaluation is to be undertaken in line with the Evaluation policy of UNDP http://web.UNDP.org/evaluation/policy.htm.

The objective of this Terminal Evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objectives, and to produce recommendations for possible follow-up actions in the near future, taking into account various donor initiatives in the region.

The report will have to provide to the recipients a complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The consultant should prepare specific ratings on all aspects of the project, as described in the 'Reporting' section of this Terms of Reference.

The Evaluation will include the assessment of the achievements of the project, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation, and the assessment of features related to the process of achieving those outputs, as well as the impacts the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework (Annex 2), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the selected performance criteria as indicated in table in Annex 3, following the provided obligatory rating scales.

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained.

The scope of the Evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.

Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from this terminal evaluation is a **comprehensive analytical report in English** that should follow the outline attached in Annex 1.

The Terminal Evaluation Report will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to UNDP complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

Special attention shall be paid to the lessons learnt as well as to the recommendations for the follow-up project. The Terminal Evaluation Report will include a separate chapter on Lessons Learnt and Recommendations, providing recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- project results on the national level;
- support to transboundary cooperation;
- impact on the regional level
- recommendations from the project stakeholders for planning of future interventions.

The report together with the annexes, shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

Responsibility for Expenses and their Reimbursement

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows:

- First payment: 25% of the total contract upon acceptance of the first field visit workplan by UNDP Project Manager;
- Second payment 50% of the total contract upon submission and acceptance of the draft Evaluation Report and acceptance by the UNDP Project Manager
- Final payment: 25% of the total contract upon submission and acceptance of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report
-

Evaluation approach

An outline of an approach for the review is provided below; however it should be made clear that the consultant is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes must be cleared by UNDP before being undertaken by the consultant.

The review must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and informative to UNDP related to issues for future programming.

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

The evaluation will be home based with 1 mission to each country of project implementation: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and to the Slovak Republic with approx. 2 days per country. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, the National Project Manager, Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders as part of the mission or missions.

The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, project budget revisions, interim reports, project files, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment.

The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum:

- UNDP BRC, UNDP Kazakhstan, UNDP Kyrgyzstan and UNDP Tajikistan and national project stakeholders.

The methodology to be used by the evaluator should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation reviewed
- Interviews
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The Evaluator is expected to follow the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (Annex 4).

Although the Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or the project management.

The Consultant should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the assignment. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Regional Center for Europe and CIS (Bratislava). UNDP will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. UNDP and the Project Manager, and National Project Managers will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the project partners, etc.

The timeframe and duration of activities are estimated to be broken down as follows:

Deliverable	Time frame	Deadlines
Completion of the Detailed Project Workplan and Table of Contents for Assignment	2 days	
Desk review, questions, analysis	2 days	
Phone Interviews with UNDP Project Managers, Project Team, UNDP BRC Staff: 2 days	2 days	
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, 1-2day missions to Kazakhstan-Kyrgyzstan-Tajikistan, Bratislava, (Nov 2012: upon agreement with UNDP Country offices)	8 days	
Draft evaluation report – to be submitted to UNDP for review and comments / circulated to key stakeholders as needed	8 days	
Final Terminal Evaluation Report	10 days	February 2013

The report shall be submitted to the UNDP RBEC Energy and Environment Team, Grosslingova 35, 811 09 Bratislava, Slovakia - Ms. Marcela Fabianova (marcela.fabianova@UNDP.org) and Ms. Daniela Carrington (daniela.carrington@UNDP.org).

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be submitted for comments to UNDP by **25 January 2013**. UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within 5 working days after receiving the draft.

The finalized Evaluation Report shall be submitted latest on **28 February 2013**.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the consultant and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

3. COMPETENCIES

Required competencies:

- Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in a team
- Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
- Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities

4. QUALIFICATIONS

The Evaluator **must be independent** from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of activities in question, i.e. he/she must not have participated in the preparation

and/or implementation of the assessed project and must not be in a conflict of interest with project-related activities.

Academic Qualifications/Education:

- Master degree in economics, engineering, environmental science or equivalent experience.

Experience:

- At least 7 years of professional experience in the field of integrated water resources management;
- Experience with UNDP projects;
- Experience with projects and related activities in Central Asia
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects, in particular with EU funded projects;
- Knowledge of MS Word, Excel and email communication software;

Language skills:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills
- Working knowledge of Russian

5. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the **combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal**.

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Academic background: 10
- Proven experience in the field integrated water resources management, management of international projects: 20
- Experience with the projects in the East Europe and Central Asia: 10
- Knowledge of evaluating programmes/projects, in particular for UNDP including knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures, experience with EU funded projects: 10
- Proven evaluation expertise with international organizations (knowledge and practical experience in development evaluations) – max points: 10
- Language skills – English and Russian: 10

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points

6. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a **brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (based or commenting on the requirements indicated in this TOR). Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Filled P11 form** including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from http://europeandcis.UNDP.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc); please upload the P11 instead of your CV.
- **Financial Proposal*** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office and on mission, travel – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs), using the following template. Please note that you are free to decide in your offer to take 1 or 2 missions to Bratislava that would amount up to approx. 5 days in total.

	Nr. of units*	Units	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office**				
		man/days		0
		man/days		0
		man/days		0
Work on mission**				
		man/days		0
		man/days		0
		man/days		0
Sub-total fee				**0**
Travel costs				
International travel to and from country/ies		mission		0
DSA		overnights		0
Local travel		destination		0
Sub-total travel costs				**0**
TOTAL				**0**

* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.
** Add rows as needed

<u>Incomplete applications will not be considered.</u> Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

Please note that the **financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged **travel costs** must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel.*
***Payments** will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*
*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have **vaccinations**/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN **security directives** set forth under dss.un.org*
***General Terms and conditions** as well as other related documents can be found under:*
http://europeandcis.UNDP.org/home/jobs
*Qualified **women** and members of **minorities** are encouraged to apply.*

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

Annexes:

i. Evaluation Report: Sample Table of Contents for Final Project Evaluation
ii. Project Logical Framework
iii. Performance criteria to be rated; The obligatory rating scales
iv. Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Annex 1 to the ToR

Evaluation Report: Sample Table of Contents for Final Project Evaluation

i. Cover page:

- Title of UNDP project
- UNDP ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[1])

1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated[2])

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

[1] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[2] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex 2 to the ToR

Project Logical Framework - Results and Resources Framework

Intended Outcome as per Regional Program for 2011-2013 - Focus Area: Energy and environment: Outcome 2: By 2013, regional, national and sub-national levels have improved capacity for sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources.
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: 1. Number of legal and regulatory frameworks that address the sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources 2. Number of interventions resulting in integration (mainstreaming) of sustainable management of ecosystems and natural resources into countries' socio-economic development frameworks"
Applicable Key Result Area (from 2008-11 Strategic Plan): Mainstreaming environment and energy; Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor **Regional programme outputs :** Adaptive water governance interventions supported at the regional, subregional, national and subnational levels / Environment and poverty issues integrated in national and subnational development planning and interventions / Regional-level interventions supported to assess, prioritize and address environment and security issues
Partnership Strategy: UNDP will be supported by the European Commission and Norway, and work closely with the EC, UNECE and OECD under the "Common Framework for addressing Water Issues in CA"
Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): ***Promoting IWRM and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia*** **/ AWARD ID: 56531**

Outputs	Targets	Activities	Implem Body	Target groups	Input
Output 1: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Kyrgyzstan Indicators: - Wheat yield - Adequate and sustainable management arrangements and instruments - Investments strategies, plans and/or financial policies - Number of investment strategies, plans and/or financial polices applying SEA in their elaboration process - No. of households provided with improved WSS services - nationally owned participatory implementation process - Transboundary sub-basin agreement - Policy reform processes	• Wheat yield > 4 T ha-1 • Participatory assessment and diagnosis processes are adopted by GOK • Participatory processes, for prioritizing IWRM issues and solutions, adopted & mngt aspects implemented • Feasibility studies (FSs) are approved • About 200 extra households provided with improved WSS services. • Investment strategies, plans and/or financial policies promulgated • SEA carried out for key documents as a part of their preparation • Management arrangements, addressing sustainability issues, are promulgated and	1.0. Support to IWRM implementation	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Pilot projects
		1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Projects	UNDP KGZ	Oblast and Rayon DWRs jointly with WUAs and NGO support	
		1.2 Kyrgyz Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans Financ.Policies	UNDP KGZ	MAWR with NGO support	
		1.3 Kyrgyz RWSS Demonstration Project	UNDP KGZ	Village CBOs with DWS and DSE and NGO support	
		1.4 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and, preferably, Uzbek authorities with Int. NGO support	
		1.5 Participatory IRBM Processes (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities assisted by NGOs	
		1.6 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	

Outputs	Targets	Activities	Implem Body	Target groups	Input
Baseline: - Wheat yield < 3 T ha^{-1} - Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited participatory processes - No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans - No investment strategies, plans or financial policies - No TB agreements in effect - No institutional integration	adopted by the GOK • GOVs promulgate (IWRM) reforms • The GOVs jointly implement a transboundary sub-basin arrangements for equitable water sharing	1.7 IRBM Institutional Reforms (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities	**TOTAL 557,000**
Output 2: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Tajikistan Indicators: - Wheat production - Adequate and sustainable management arrangements and instruments - Investments strategies, plans and/or financial policies - Number of investment strategies, plans and/or financial polices applying SEA in their elaboration process - No. of households provided with improved WSS services - nationally owned participatory implementation process - Transboundary sub-basin agreement - Policy reform processes Baseline: - Negligible wheat production - Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of	• Wheat prod demonstrated and adopted by farmers on 10% of the Demonstration service area • Participatory assessment and diagnosis processes are adopted by GOT • Feasibility studies (FSs) are approved • About 200 extra households provided with improved WSS services. • Participatory implementation process, addressing health/sustainability impacts of WSS service levels/project rules, is promulgated and adopted by the GOT • Participatory processes, for prioritizing IWRM issues and solutions, adopted & mngt aspects implemented • Investment strategies, plans and/or financial policies promulgated • SEA carried out for key documents as a part of their preparation • Management arrangements, addressing	2.0. Support to IWRM development	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Services - Studies Pilot projects
		2.1 Tajik Irrigation Demonstration Projects	UNDP TJK	Oblast and Rayon OMAs jointly with WUAs and NGO support	
		2.2 Tajik Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans&Financ.Policies	UNDP TJK	MWRI with NGO support	
		2.3 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Demo Project	UNDP TJK	Village CBOs with OMA and/or SUE and NGO support	
		2.4 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Investment Strategies, Plans&Financ.Policies	UNDP TJK	MWRI with NGO support services	
		2.5 Tajik Small-scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, Plans & Financ. Policies	UNDP TJK	MEI with NGO	
		2.6 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management agreement (Taj-part)	UNDP TJK	Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and, preferably, Uzbek authorities with Int. NGO support	
		2.7 Participatory Int.River Basin Management Processes (Taj-part)	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities assisted by NGOs y	
		2.8 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Taj-part)	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	

Outputs	Targets	Activities	Implem Body	Target groups	Input
management instruments; limited participatory processes - No investment strategies, plans or financial policies - No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans - Initial Small-scale Hydropower investment strategy - No TB agreements in effect - No institutional integration	sustainability issues, are promulgated and adopted by the GOT promulgated • GOVs promulgate (IWRM) reforms • The GOVs jointly implement a transboundary sub-basin agreement for equitable water-energy-cost sharing	2.9 International River Basin Management Institutional Support (Taj-part)	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities	TOTAL: 1,626,000
Output 3: Transboundary dialogue in the Ili-Balkhash River Basin Indicators - transboundary coordination procedures - Documentation and database - Stakeholder / public engagement level Baseline: - reluctantly enforced framework agreement - Limited or un-systematic documentation - No RB management plan - No significant engagement of stakeholders	• Functional Commission and Working Groups • Regular bilateral meetings at political and technical level • Relevant documentation available in suitable database • River basin management activities • Regular engagement of key stakeholders and information of the public in transboundary matters	3.1. Policy and institutional analysis	UNDP KAZ	Water Resources Committee, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Pilot projects TOTAL **791,000**
		3.2. Support to bilateral cooperation and joint activities	UNDP KAZ	Water Resources Committee, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council , Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, bordering regional administrations	
		3.3. Support to bilateral commission and framework agreements	UNDP KAZ	Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, Water Resources Committee	
		3.4. Coordinating and harmonizing water management activities&plans in the basin, stakeholders engagement	UNDP KAZ	Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, Water Resources Committee	

Outputs	Targets	Activities	Implem Body	Target groups	Input
Output 4: Regional Dialogue, IWRM Governance and Sector Capacity Building Indicators: - Regional sector and organization management capacity - Project implementation quality - Capacity for integrating environment and climate change issues into water management planning Baseline: - Limited sector and organization management capacity - Project implementation not yet started - Limited capacity for integrating environment into water management planning	• Regional sector and organization management capacity enhanced • Efficient & effective project implementation • Priority issues are discussed and regional documents are elaborated • Increased capacity for integrating environment and climate changes issue into water management planning • Strengthened transb. cooperation on water and climate issues • Jointly developed scenarios, documents are adopted • Relevant experience is disseminated and shared among all interested parties	4.1: Project Management and Coordination, Support to Bilateral Cooperation 4.2: Regional Dialogue and Water Governance 4.3: Sector Capacity Building 4.4.: Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms	UNDP BRC	MAWR, MWRI, Bilateral Commission, Regional bodies, resources institutions and think tanks, NGOs and local authorities	UNDP Staff Intl. consultants Capacity building workshops Travels Additional TRAC resources required: Intl. consultants – tech. Final Seminar Capacity building seminar TOTAL 1,426,000
TOTAL					4,400,000

Annex 3 to the ToR

Performance criteria to be rated

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**Rating**
Relevance		Financial resources:	MU
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	L
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	ML
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	L
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	L

The obligatory rating scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) ***Impact Ratings:*** 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

Annex 4 to the ToR

Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[3]

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at ……..*place* on …….*date*

Signature: _____

[3] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex B Itinerary

Date	Organisation	Place
20 January		>> Bratislava – SLK
21 January	UNDP Bratislava	Bratislava – SLK
22 January	UNDP Bratislava	Bratislava – SLK
23 January		>> NL
4 February 2013		>> Almaty – KZS
5 February 2013	Centre for Sustainable development	
	CAREC	
6 February 2013	KazHydromet	Almaty – KZS
		>> Bishkek – KGZ
7 February 2013	Project team	Bishkek – KGZ
	Climate Risk Management	
	Committee for Water resources	
	World Bank Improved Water Management Project	
	Chu-Talas Water Commission	
	Environment Programme	
	Chair KR Union of Water Users Association	
	Water Resource and Melioration Department	
	Environment Programme	
	Environment&DRM	
8 February 2013	Min Construction and regional development	Bishkek – KGZ
	UNDP	
	Helvetas	
	NGO TAIC	
	WB	
	WB Water project	
	Institute for water projects	
	Public Organization “Irrigation Agrarian Consult”	
9 February 2013		>> Almaty – KZS
10 February 2013		>> Dushanbe – TJK
		>> Khudjand – TJK (flight cancelled)
	Project staff	Dushanbe – TJK
11 February 2013	Project staff	Dushanbe – TJK
	Dep. Minister MinVodKhoz	
	Secr. Water commission Central Asia	
	Field Visit irrigation	Hissar – TJK
12 February 2013	Commission for water and energy	Dushanbe – TJK
	Kanibadam Water Resource Department	
	Head of Isfara State Water Resource Department	
	Irrigation Systems Operation Department, MLRWR	
	Water management (national and regional)	
	UNDP	
13 February 2013		>> Almaty – KZS
	Project staff	Almaty – KSZ
14 February 2013	Project staff	
	Balkhash-Alakol Basin Inspection	
15 February	developers of database on System Monitoring	>> NL

Annex C List of persons interviewed

Name	First name	Organisation	Place
Mamaev	Vladimir	UNDP	Bratislava (SLK)
Carrington	Daniela	UNDP	Bratislava (SLK)
Alekseeva	Natalia	Project team leader	Bratislava (SLK)
Fabianova	Marcela	UNDP	Bratislava (SLK)
Kozhakhmetov	Paiyzkhan	Kazhydromet	Almaty (KAZ)
Dolgikh	Svetlana	Kazhydromet	Almaty (KAZ)
Mustafina	Vera	Centre for Sustainable Development	Almaty (KAZ)
Nikiforova	Lydiya	Kazhydromet	Almaty (KAZ)
Strikeleva	Ekaterina	CAREC	Almaty (KAZ)
Temirbekov	Aleksandr	IWRM project team	Bishkek (KGS)
Apasov	Rysbek	IWRM project team	Bishkek (KGS)
Osmonaliev	Islan	EU Delegation	Bishkek (KGS)
Karasartov	Shaibek	HELVETAS and NGO TAIC	Bishkek (KGS)
Jooshev	Paizidin	HELVETAS and NGO TAIC	Bishkek (KGS)
Abdillaeva	Jyldys	HELVETAS and NGO TAIC	Bishkek (KGS)
Beishekeev	Kydykbek	World Bank Improved Water Management Project	Bishkek (KGS)
Koshmatov	Barataly	World Bank Improved Water Management Project	Bishkek (KGS)
Toktoshev	Askarbek	Water Supply&Sanit Department	Bishkek (KGS)
Isabekov	Tilek	Chu-Talas Water Commission	Bishkek (KGS)
Kojoev	Erkin	Chair of the KR Union of Water Users Association	Bishkek (KGS)
Sakhvaeva	Ekaterina	Water Resource and Melioration Department	Bishkek (KGS)
Djiloobaev	Abdibai	Water Resource and Melioration Department	Bishkek (KGS)
Tashtanaliev	Kokumbek	Water Resource and Melioration Department	Bishkek (KGS)
Kylychev	Kumar	Environment Programme	Bishkek (KGS)
Ibragimov	Daniyar	Environment&DRM	Bishkek (KGS)
Kasybekov	Erkin	ARR	Bishkek (KGS)
Baisalova	Aigul	IWRM project team	Bishkek (KGS)
Isamutdinov	Saifullo	Public Organization “Irrigation Agrarian Consult”	Bishkek (KGS)
Khomidov	Abdujabbor	Water Users Federation in Kanibadam district	Khudjand (TJK)
Shukur	Etmishev	WUA “Ob Haet” in Kanibadam district	Khudjand (TJK)
Zoidov	Malham	WUA “Mehnatobod” in Isfara district,	Khudjand (TJK)
Nazirov	Zarif	Kanibadam Water Resource Department	Khudjand (TJK)
Shomirsaidov	Rustam	Head of Isfara State Water Resource Department	Khudjand (TJK)

Name	First name	Organisation	Place
Isamutdinov	Saifullo	Director of NGO “Irrigation Agrarian Consult”	Khudjand (TJK)
Khomidov	Abdujabbor	Water Users Federation in Kanibadam district,	Khudjand (TJK)
Shukur	Etmishev	WUA“Ob Haet” Kanibadam distr	Khudjand (TJK)
Rakhimov	Sulton	FD Minister, Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources of the RT (MLRWR)	Dushanbe (TJK)
Aliev	Kodir	Irrigation Systems Operation Department, MLRWR	Dushanbe (TJK)
Sharofiddinov	Khusniddin	MLRWR,	Dushanbe (TJK)
Gafarov	Bakhrom	Tajik branch of SIC, Project National Expert	Dushanbe (TJK)
Fattoeva	Munavara	Project National Expert, Economist	Dushanbe (TJK)
Babadjanova	Malika	CAREC, Director	Dushanbe (TJK)
Ibodzoda	Khairullo	Executive Office of the President, Dep. for Ecology and Emergency Situations	Dushanbe (TJK)
Kholov	Khurshed	Energy and Environment Programme UNDP	Dushanbe (TJK)
Lazarev	Segey	UNESCO	
Kenshimov	Amirkhan	Project team	Almaty (KAZ)
Zhumabayev	Yerlan	Project team	Almaty (KAZ)
Makashova	Dariga	Project team	Almaty (KAZ)
Kim	Marina	Project team	Almaty (KAZ)
Mukatayev	Serikaliy	Balkhash-Alakol Basin Inspection	Almaty (KAZ)
Tleulesova	Aitzhamal	Balkhash-Alakol Basin Inspection	Almaty (KAZ)
Murtazin	Yermek	developers of database on System Monitoring	Almaty (KAZ)
Moldagaliyev	Marat	developers of database on System Monitoring	Almaty (KAZ)
Meerbach	David	WB – Water management Central asia	Bishkek (KGZ)
Pradeep	Sharma	UNDP – DRR	Bishkek (KGS)
Makarov	Oleg	Project construction and techno Institute	Bishkek (KGS)
Uzakbaeva	Zhyldyz	Climate Risk Management	Bishkek (KGS)

Annex D Summary of field visits

Field visits has been brought to:

- Almaty
- Bishkek
- Dushanbe
- Khudjand / Isfara (flight cancelled, replace by additional meetings in Dushanbe and with regional water management organization of Isfara coming to Dushanbe)

Talks has been held with representatives of state recipients, water management, international project representative, Hydromet, experts, regional authorities, NGOs.

Aim of the meetings was to identify how the project was received, the strong and weak points of the project, its sustainability, impact and ideas for future project development.

Main topics state water policy development, bottlenecks in the implementation of practical water management, resolution of project management, needs for project development to sustain the project result, sustainability of the project and potential partners and co-financers by future project development.

Annex E List of documents reviewed

1. Pro-documents
2. Project addendum
3. Monitoring reports and management responses
4. Inception report
5. Interim reports
6. Project quarterly reports (selective)
7. Final report (not received yet)
8. Official letters and Memorandums on cooperation
9. Event reports
10. Project staffing
11. Work plans
12. Publicity and visibility
13. Overview key meetings
14. TORs for project personnel (selected)
15. Project Proposal for third parties (OSCE, Czech Republic and others)
16. Basin Plan on the integrated water resources management and water efficiency in the Aral-Syr Darya Basin

Activities	
Kyrgyzstan	
1.0. Support to IWRM implementation	National IWRM review report on the regulatory systems of water issues in KGZ The 2nd National Conference of the Water Users Associations in support to the Department on Water Management and Melioration of the Ministry of Agriculture and Melioration, Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek, March 1-2; Round Table "Climate Change impacts on the water resources and agriculture sector: Adaptation strategy of Kyrgyzstan", Bishkek, 16 March 2012; Conference entitled "Global Climate Change: Adaptation Strategy of Kyrgyzstan", March 28-29, 2012. Analysis scheme of water management system reform under the water code KGZ Rules and regulations of the National Water Council – confirmed National strategy on Climate Change Adaption Scenarios for effect of climate change on flow of surface water KGZ Set up Union of WUAs TOR for the water management national consultant to integrate IWRM principles into the strategy of agrarian sector development Report on Project Component "Complex of Activities for the Processing and Implementation of a Pilot Demonstration Project to Improve the Irrigation of Crops"(in Russian)
1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Projects	Booklets on irrigation – Kyrgyzstan Handbook for irrigation of agricultural cultures in Kyrgyzstan

Activities	
	On-farm Water Management Project – Efficient Use of Water (SEP) – Helvetas Two practical training sessions on resource mobilization were conducted with the main partners from the Kyrgyzstan Union of WUAs and Public Association 'Training, Advice and Innovation Centre (TAIC) for ACT in Central Asia to attract the co-financing funds for IWRM project activities in Kyrgyzstan; Study in Batken region on opportunities and needs of water user associations
1.2 Kyrgyz Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	Draft concept for the development strategy of investments and tariff policies in irrigation General review of the financial strategies – confirm from 2 sides Review of existing trends in economic performance of irrigation sector funding in KGZ Plan of recommended action to promote investments and tariff in the irrigation sector in KGZ Guidelines for development of the Integrated Financial Strategy for the Sustainable Water Management in Kyrgyzstan Analysis of various tools to sustain the water sector (with OECD)
1.3 Kyrgyz RWSS Demonstration Project	Report on Social Mobilization to Improve Water Supply and Sanitation in village Kara-Bulak (in Russian) Synopsis – Community Mobilization Campaign for RWWS pilot (KGZ) Report on Rural Water Supply and Sanitation in Kara-Bulak (KGZ) Trainings on drinking water organization and accounting Social analysis of water supply in Kara Bulak Establishment of CADWC Kara Bulak
1.4 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management (Kyr-part)	Report on pilot project in the Panfilov district (KGZ) Reports on pilot project in the Panfilov district (KGZ) Reports on pilot project in the Batken region (KGZ) Agreement between the Batken and Sughd administration Scope and purpose of the KGZ-TJK cooperation for the Isfara basin
1.5 Participatory IRBM Processes (Kyr-part)	Poster on IWRM project in Kyrgyzstan Poster on IWRM project in Kyrgyzstan (in Russian)
1.6 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Kyr-part)	Report on activities of the Commission of the Republic of KAZAKHSTAN AND THE Kyrgyz Republic on the Use of Water Management Facilities of the Intergovernmental Status on the Chu and Talas Rivers in 2010 – 2011 Report of the commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Replublic on the use of water management facilities of intergovernmental status on the Chu and Talas Rivers on its activities in 2008-2009 Set up of the system of automatic monitoring of the safety of the Kirovkogo water reservoir on the transboundary river Talas Chumysh Dam automatisation
1.7 IRBM Institutional Reforms (Kyr-part)	Workshop 'Implementation of IWRM in KGZ'
Tajikistan	
2.0. Support to IWRM development	Report on the National IWRM and Conflict Prevention training (TJK) Monitoring, organization and financing of AVPs – TJK (rus) National overview green economic development – TJK (UNDESA / UNDP / TJK gov) Analytic overview on setup and perspectives of integral water resource management in Tajikistan – TJK (rus) Summary of analytic review of the integrated water resource management in the republic of Tajikistan Water Codex – TJK (rus) Law on Environment – TJK (rus)

Activities	
	Law on water use associations – TJK (rus) Second Inter-Ministerial Coordination Council (IMCC) meeting on drinking water supply, 19 March, Dushanbe; Training IWRM and management of water conflicts Support to the National Water and Energy Council Donor activity overview TJK
2.1 Tajik Irrigation Demonstration Projects	Booklets on irrigation – Tajikistan Setup and organization council for water users – TJK (rus) Innovation water efficiency technologies – TJK (rus) Types and mechanism on water use conflict and solutions – TJK (rus) Setup and organization work of basin water committee – TJK (rus) Irrigation inventory Isfara basin TJK
2.2 Tajik Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	Feasibility Study for Rehabilitation of Hydrological Post "Tanguy Vorukh" in Isfara District (in Russian) Report on Project Component "Complex of Activities for the Processing and Implementation of a Pilot Demonstration Project to Improve the Irrigation of Crops"(in Russian) Irrigation Systems Inventory Methodology in Tajikistan – national compulsory – replicated by min of land reclamation and water resources in 6 districts (confirmed from 2 sides)
2.3 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Demonstration Project	Water Supply and Sanitation Study Tour report (TJK) Establishment Inter-ministerial Council – confirmed from 2 sides 918 households with improve drinking water access Self-sufficient unit under department of Communal services for water supply maintenance
2.4 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	Training modules for drinking water supply sector (TJK) Handbook for tech inventory of drinking water supply and canalization – TJK (rus) Manual 'On issuing permits for implementation of drinking water supply and sanitation projects' Guidelines on passing administrative procedures for DWS Projects
2.5 Tajik Small-scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	TOR SHP construction on irrigation channels / structures
2.6 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management agreement (Taj-part)	IWRM review for Zeravshan basin (TJK) Review Currant conditions of water in the Isfara river basin Agreement between the Batken and Sughd administration Scope and purpose of the KGZ-TJK cooperation for the Isfara basin Set up Resettlement Coordination Commission and District Development Council Isfara district
2.7 Participatory International River Basin Management Processes (Taj-part)	IWRM review report, Tajikistan - in Russian The training on "Experience of introduction of integrated water resource management elements and transboundary dialogue in the sub-basin of Isfara River" was held on February 21-22, 2012 in Kayrakkum, Sughd Oblast; Settlement of 6 WUA Isfara Federation of WUAs for Isfara basin and water committee
2.8 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Taj-part)	Rehabilitation of the Transboundary hydropost in isfara basin (Tangi-vorukh and Madpari) incl. feasibility study
2.9 International River Basin Management Institutional Support (Taj-part)	
Kazakhstan	

Activities	
3.1. Policy and institutional analysis	Comments to the Water Development Strategy, Kazakhstan (in Russian) Analysis of changes and additions to the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan providing legal frameworks for management and use of water resources (KAZ) Draft analysis report for Ili-Balkhash Basin CD practical info and research Book 'IWRM experience in Kazakhstan
3.2. Support to bilateral cooperation and joint activities	Workshop on effective water resources using in Ile-Balkhash basin with preliminary survey, 16 March – survey, 28 March 2012 – the workshop in Yesyk city, Almaty oblast; Database Reports: Hydrochemistry and Hydrology Central Asia IWLearn.org site Trainings on water legal issues, resulting in court case against regional authorities Proposals for introduction of drip irrigation
3.3. Support to bilateral commission and framework agreements	IWRM and Water Conservation Basin Plan for Balkhash-Alakol' Basin Intergovernmental Water Relations in Ili-Balkhash Basin Capacity building programme for 2011 (Ili-Balkhash Basin component - KAZ) Agreement on 2 new transboundary division work – confirmed from >2 sides Chinese support of capacity building water efficiency
3.4. Coordinating and harmonizing water management activities&plans in the basin, stakeholders engagement	Database report National workshop in Astana on the Methodology and parameters of Database and System Monitoring in Ile-Balkhash basin, 23 February 2012; Joint work plan for the Basin Council Programme on development and modernisation in Kazakhstan until 2020 National plan of integrated water resource management and water conservation – finalised by third party
Central Asia	
4.1: Project Management and Coordination, Support to Bilateral Cooperation	Overview of Regional Transboundary Water Agreements, Institutions and Relevant Legal/Policy Activities in Central Asia – final report Analysis of Past and Ongoing IWRM Interventions in CA – final report Transboundary water agreements institutions and activities in CA (ver 1.)
4.2: Regional Dialogue and Water Governance	Communications and Visibility Plan (January- December 2012) IRWM interventions on the regional level Past and Ongoing Projects in CA (ver 2.) Communications and Visibility Strategy Report Small hydro facilities at regional level – Co-financing, finalised by third party
4.3: Sector Capacity Building	Review of capacity building and activities
4.4.: Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms	Review the Current Status of Water Resources and Water Use, Depending on Climatic Parameters (in Russian) Report Adaptation of Water Sector in Kyrgyzstan to Global Climate Change (in Russian) Scientific and Technical Report - "Evaluation of the Possible Evolution of Water Loss of Glaciers and Runoff in Kyrgyzstan with Different Reliability of Projected Climate Change" (in Russian) Review of the Current Situation and Preliminary Recommendations for Actions to Adapt to Climate Change in the Chu-Talas Basin Review of the Situation and Preliminary Recommendations for Action, to Adapt to Climate Change in the Chu-Talas Basin (in Russian) Review and recommendations on the climate change adaption in Chu-Talas Transboundary Water Basin – final draft (KAZ) Safety basins in central asia: setup potential regional cooperation – Eecon Com / UN water

Activities	
	issues nr 5

Annex F Matrix for rating of achievement of outcomes (EU and UNDP Matrix)

MATRIX FOR RATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES (based on the 2012 Logframe EU format) (results preliminary filled in)

Color Coding
Green: completed, indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow: indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project
Red: indicator shows poor achievement – unlikely to be completed by project

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	Performance Indicator	2008 Baseline	2012 End of Project Target	2012 End of Project Status	Terminal Evaluation Comments	Rating
Project objective: Improved dialogue on IWRM in CA countries and at the regional level: number of joint initiatives, documents and activities; Improved statistics on water use, water supply & sanitation; Successful replication of IWRM approaches and techniques among CA countries; Bilateral cooperation and relevant agreements on transboundary waters are facilitated & signed, relevant joint management bodies are supported/or	Improved dialogue on IWRM in CA countries and at the regional level: number of joint initiatives, documents and activities; Improved statistics on water use, water supply & sanitation; Successful replication of IWRM approaches and techniques among CA countries; Bilateral cooperation and relevant agreements on transboundary waters are facilitated & signed, relevant joint management bodies are supported/or established.	No baseline	Improved dialogue Improved Successful Present	Present improved Replication Present, bilateral		S

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
established.						
Specific objectives: The project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia through interventions at national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and at transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).						
Outcome 1 & 2 **1.** In **Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan** (Outputs 1 and 2) - to develop and implement integrated water resources management and water efficiency strategies/plans at national and basin level. Additionally - to develop sub-sector strategies/plans and demonstrate best IWRM practices in rural water supply and sanitation (RWSS), small hydropower (SHP) and irrigation efficiency through implementation of demonstration projects. Thirdly, to support IWRM	1. National targets/strategies/plans are developed and adopted by the relevant governmental bodies; 2. State financing is assigned to IWRM activities implementation on the national and basin level; 3. Sub-sector strategies, investments plans or other strategic documents are developed and adopted by the authorities 4. Demonstrations projects are implemented and under replication; 5. IWRM documents and processes at the water basin level established/running - including RBM Plans,	1. not present 2.not assigned 3.not present 4. in other basin present 5. basic approach	1. present 2.assigned 3.adopted 4. implemented and under replication 5. RBM plan on national level agreed and functioning	1. present 2. Basic assigned TJK 3. developed and under adoption 4. implemented and under replication 5. plan and structure under effective establishment. Laws adapted, regional	In both countries a big leap forwards are made on IWRM, on legal, organizational and implementation	HS

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
implementation at water basin level, including in transboundary basins.	agreements, functioning Water Councils, stakeholders groups or other as relevant.			agreement signed Isfara RBM to be agreed in next Inter-ministerial meeting		
Outcome 3 **In the Ili-Balkhash River Basin** (Output 3) - to foster transboundary dialogue and enhance cooperation between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China for improved management of the shared River Basin system and its resources.	1. A dialogue platform is established and information is exchanged both at government and river basin level; 2. Bilateral activities are agreed and coordinated under the Commission; 3. IWRM capacity building is supported; 4. Regularity in meetings, information exchange and other joint activities.	1. not present 2.not agreed 3. 4. implemented and under replication	1. present 2. agreed 3. Supported 4. implemented and under replication	1. present on river basin level 2. partly agreed, cooperation re-confirmed 3.Supported 4. implemented and under replication	On regional level is the Basin Council highly supported. All major stakeholders are included. Decisions of Basin council taken over for execution. Due to the difference in level of water management between China and KAZ no agreement reached, but cooperation on technical level in progress. Public is taking their rights on water by court	S
Outcome 4 **At a pan-regional level** (Output 4) - to build regional capacity and provide adequate expert support to project processes and relevant regional institutions to ensure efficient and effective project implementation, pan-regional coordination of activities (in and outside the scope of this project), as well as policy advise and platform for IWRM dialogue	1. IWRM Dialogue is supported at the regional level; 2. Capacity building program is designed and some measures are implemented; 3. Coordination of water-related interventions is improved at the regional level; 4. IWRM national and transboundary interventions under the project are harmonized and relevant experience exchange is functional;	1. limited supported 2.not designed 3. 4.	1. supported 2. designed 3.improved 4. harmonized	1. mainly national supported 2. partly designed and implemented 3. limited improved 4. progress concentrated on national level		MS

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
at regional level, addressing climate change issues via IWRM tools and instruments.	5. IWRM-related and water cooperation documentation is addressing climate change issues.	5. not present	5. present	5. present for Kyrgyzstan and Chu-Talas		
Results:						
TJK/KGZ National / regional level						
1. Realistic national targets, strategies, investment plans and financial policies, which will be informed by the results of demonstration projects (next result).	1. National targets, strategies, investment plans and financial policies developed and approved (in RWSS, SHP and irrigation) - relevant state decrees or protocols in/by 2012; 2. State funding is assigned to their implementation - at least 50% of proposed costs is covered from the state budget; 3. External funding is identified (with confirmed state inputs) by the end of the project; 4. IWRM Dialogue is ongoing at the national level in coordination with NPD and relevant strategies/plans are adopted.	1. 2. 3. 4. implemented and under replication	1. main in place 2. state funding assigned > 50% 3. external funding identified 4. implemented and under replication	1. most in place 2. state funding partly assigned, for TJK other part will be private water cost 3.external funding identified but not confirmed 4. implemented and under replication		HS
2. Demonstration projects that inform practical management instruments	1. Increased number of people in demo projects with improved access to	1.	1.	1. 900 households TJK, investment plan KGZ		S

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
and feasibility studies and can be scaled-up and replicated, based on available national, donor or private sector funding.	drinking/irrigated water - at least 5000 in 2012; 2. Increased capacities for water measuring/allocation - i.e. expanded monitoring parameters list and frequency of sampling, agreed data-exchange protocols in 2012; 3. Percentage of project costs covered by recipient communities - at least 20%; 4. Improved quality of water in pilot locations; 5. Number of agreed locations for replication - at least 5 during the project implementation; 6. Adequate funding is mobilized for demonstration projects (amount TBC based on technical documentation/feasibility studies); 7. Potential funding is identified for replication and scale-up of demonstration projects by the end of the project duration.	2. 3. 4. 5. 6. xx 7. not identifeid	2. 3. % covered by recipient communities > 20% 4. water quality improved 5. locations for replication>= 5 6. xx 7. identified	2. partly achieved 3. % covered by recipient communities > 20% 4. water quality will be improved, .. ready for investment 5. locations for replication present but number not identified 6. funding situation is improved 7. partly identified		
Basin results						
3. Development and implementation of:	1. Interstate agreement/protocol and	1.	1.	1. interstate agreement exists and		S

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
(i) a joint management arrangements – for equitable water, energy and O&M cost sharing – in Isfara transboundary sub-basin; (ii) context-specific participatory IWRM processes - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers; (iii) context-specific institutional reforms - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers.	commission/working group exist for small transboundary sub basin - at least 1 agreement and 1 joint body by the end of 2012; 2. IWRM bilateral process is on-going - joint activities/operations in the selected river basins are agreed and partially implemented in 2012; 3. Data-exchange process is facilitated and supported - documentation on relevant activities is available; 4. Stakeholders engagement and support is ensured - WUAs support, public meetings etc.	 2. 3. 4. implemented and under replication	 2. under implementation 3. Database established and accepted 4. implemented and under replication	joint body 2. under implementation 3. Database established and accepted 4. implemented and under replication		
Ili-Balkhash basin						
4. Intensified bilateral cooperation activities and stakeholders engagement	1. Joint data base established (% of improvement in knowledge of key river basin data, number of agreed factors/shared data); 2. Agreed IBB Management Plan is prepared in 2012 and endorsed by the Water Basin Council; 3. Number of engaged stakeholders on the basin level - at least 20 during the	1. 2. 3.	1. joint database 2.Management plan established 3. >20	1. KAZ database established 2. For KAZ established and endorsed 3. not measurable	Intensified bi-lateral cooperation on technical level. Common water division work, training by China on water efficiency. Strong and active stakeholder involvement on national basin level in Kazakhstan is highly satisfactory.	S

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
	project duration; 4. Number of government agencies and stakeholders involved in basin data collection - at least 20; 5. Number of joint activities or actions taking place - at least 5 activities annually; 6. Frequency of communication and updates to the data base -at least monthly.	 4. 5. established/running 6.	 4. stakeholders>20 5. joint activities > 5/y 6.> monthly	 4. stakeholders >> 20 5. joint activities = ?/y 6. > weekly		
5. Improved base for cooperation (such as provisions for the water-sharing agreement and raised capacities of the Commission, basin authorities and stakeholders)	1. Regular Commission meetings are held and expert work groups are established (number of the meetings, frequency, list of participants - i.e. equitable participation); 2. Legal framework is improved and operational - officially endorsed documents and agreements; 3. Financial sustainability of cooperation - amount of annual contributions to IBB-work from governments and its trends; 4. IWRM activities are promoted in the basin and on the national level; 5. Capacities of the Commission, CWR, BABI,	1. irregular 2. 3. not present 4. 5.	1. regular 2. improved and operational 3. present 4. promoted 5. capacity of institutions and	1. established and functioning. irregular based on funding 2. Legal framework limited improved 3. not present 4. promoted, national budget raised but not timely received 5. capacity of institutions and	On Kaz basin level very well established. Not transboundary yet due to lack of common level of decision making. Will improve now KAZ min of environment is becoming responsible for transboundary management	S

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
	WBC and other stakeholders are raised - improved provisions, procedures, expertise (number of developed joint documents and new activities).		stakeholders raised	stakeholders raised		
Regional level						
6. Improved capacities of national and sub-regional stakeholders in IWRM activities	1. Capacity building program/priorities and its support is agreed with partners; 2. Number of trainings and seminars (at least 5), and participants (at least 200); 3. Improved knowledge and skills - at least 75% of the training participants have noted it in the evaluation forms; 4. Documentation on best practices and techniques - at least 3 publications/reports by the end of the project.	1. 2. 3. 4.	1. support capacity building agreed 2. > 5 and >2000 participants 3. evaluated, >75% improved knowledge 4. >=3 reports on best practices	1. agreed in steering committee 2. not identified 3. not measurable, as influenced by national capacity building 4. ??		MS
7. Sub-regional dialogue on IWRM implementation and addressing climate change issues under IWRM frameworks	1. Number of studies/expert reports/recommendations on IWRM - at least 4, documented and agreed; 2. Number of agreed measures/approaches on the regional/transboundary level - at least 3, documented;	1. 2.	1. >=4 2. >=3	1. ?? 2. Diifferent levels. On Isfara, Chymys, Ili Balhash basin.		S

Project goal: Promoting IWRM and fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	**Performance Indicator**	**2008 Baseline**	**2012 End of Project Target**	**2012 End of Project Status**	**Terminal Evaluation Comments**	**Rating**
	3. Number of relevant seminars - at least 3; 4. Number of seminar participants - at least 100; 5. Regional statements/commitments initiated by the project - at least 2 by the end of the project.	3. 4. 5. established/running	3.>=3 4. participants >100 5. >=2 committments	3. >3 4. expected > 100 5. ongoing		
8. Effective project management and implementation of project activities	1. IWRM national and transboundary interventions under the project are harmonized - joint documents and activities (at least among Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan); 2. Project documentation and reports are delivered in time; 3. Work-plans are timely communicated and endorsed by key stakeholders; 4. Coordination platform is owned and supported by adequate regional bodies, functioning and updated - at least monthly updates; 5. Project web-site is regularly updated - at least monthly.	1. 2. 3. 4. implemented and under replication 5. established/running	1. joint documents 2.in time 3. timely endorsed 4. implemented and under replication 5. established/running	1. existing 2. more or less in time 3. inception severely delayed, others timely 4. implemented and under replication 5. established/running		MS

MATRIX FOR RATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES based on UNDP project logframe (preliminary filled in)

Intended Outcome as per Regional Program for 2011-2013 – Focus Area: Energy and environment: Outcome 2: By 2013, regional, national and sub-national levels have improved capacity for sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources.
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: 1. Number of legal and regulatory frameworks that address the sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources 2. Number of interventions resulting in integration (mainstreaming) of sustainable management of ecosystems and natural resources into countries' socio-economic development frameworks"
Applicable Key Result Area (from 2008-11 Strategic Plan): Mainstreaming environment and energy; Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor **Regional programme outputs :** Adaptive water governance interventions supported at the regional, subregional, national and subnational levels / Environment and poverty issues integrated in national and subnational development planning and interventions / Regional-level interventions supported to assess, prioritize and address environment and security issues
Partnership Strategy: UNDP will be supported by the European Commission and Norway, and work closely with the EC, UNECE and OECD under the "Common Framework for addressing Water Issues in CA"
Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): ***Promoting IWRM and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia*** **/ AWARD ID: 56531**

Outputs	Targets	Achievements	Activities	Implem. Body	Target groups	Input
Output 1: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Kyrgyzstan Indicators: - Wheat yield - Adequate and sustainable management arrangements and instruments - Investments strategies, plans and/or financial policies - Number of investment strategies, plans and/or financial polices applying SEA in their elaboration process - No. of households provided with improved WSS services - nationally owned participatory implementation process - Transboundary sub-basin agreement - Policy reform processes **Baseline:** - Wheat yield < 3 T ha^{-1} - Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited participatory processes	• Wheat yield > 4 T ha-1 • Participatory assessment and diagnosis processes are adopted by GOK • Participatory processes, for prioritizing IWRM issues and solutions, adopted & mngt aspects implemented • Feasibility studies (FSs) are approved • About 200 extra households provided with improved WSS services. • Investment strategies, plans and/or financial policies promulgated • SEA carried out for key documents as a part of their preparation	• Wheat yield 20% up to 2.5 • Water use -30% • realised • Adopted • approved • for 900 households investment plan • Realised • No SEA has been carried out. Not relevant.	3.0. Support to IWRM implementation	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Pilot projects
			1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Projects	UNDP KGZ	Oblast and Rayon DWRs jointly with WUAs and NGO support	
			1.2 Kyrgyz Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP KGZ	MAWR with NGO support	
			1.3 Kyrgyz RWSS Demonstration Project	UNDP KGZ	Village CBOs with DWS and DSE and NGO support	**TOTAL 557,000**
			1.4 Small Transboundary	UNDP	Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and, preferably,	

Outputs	Targets	Achievements	Activities	Implem. Body	Target groups	Input
- No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans - No investment strategies, plans or financial policies - No TB agreements in effect - No institutional integration	• Management arrangements, addressing sustainability issues, are promulgated and adopted by the GOK • GOVs promulgate (IWRM) reforms • The GOVs jointly implement a transboundary sub-basin arrangements for equitable water sharing	• Partly realised, process underway • Realised • Agreement between regions. GOVs under preparation	Sub-basin management (Kyr-part)	KGZ	Uzbek authorities with Int. NGO support	
			1.5 Participatory IRBM Processes (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities assisted by NGOs	
			1.6 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	
			1.7 IRBM Institutional Reforms (Kyr-part)	UNDP KGZ	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities	
Output 2: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Tajikistan Indicators: - Wheat production - Adequate and sustainable management arrangements and instruments - Investments strategies, plans and/or financial policies - Number of investment strategies, plans and/or financial polices applying SEA in their elaboration process - No. of households provided with improved WSS services - nationally owned participatory implementation process - Transboundary sub-basin agreement - Policy reform processes Baseline: - Negligible wheat production - Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited	• Wheat prod demonstrated and adopted by farmers on 10% of the Demonstration service area • Participatory assessment and diagnosis processes are adopted by GOT • Feasibility studies (FSs) are approved • About 200 extra households provided with improved WSS services. • Participatory implementation process, addressing health/sustainability impacts of WSS service levels/project rules, is promulgated and adopted by the GOT	• Wheat production raised 35% • Water use -30% • 2500 ha improved access to water • Adopted • Approved • Investment plan ready, 1000 households with improved water supply • Approved and adopted	4.0. Support to IWRM development	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Services - Studies Pilot projects
			2.1 Tajik Irrigation Demonstration Projects	UNDP TJK	Oblast and Rayon OMAs jointly with WUAs and NGO support	
			2.2 Tajik Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP TJK	MWRI with NGO support	
			2.3 Tajik Rural Water Supply	UNDP	Village CBOs with OMA and/or SUE	

Outputs	Targets	Achievements	Activities	Implem. Body	Target groups	Input
participatory processes - No investment strategies, plans or financial policies - No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans - Initial Small-scale Hydropower investment strategy - No TB agreements in effect - No institutional integration	• Participatory processes, for prioritizing IWRM issues and solutions, adopted & mngt aspects implemented • Management arrangements, addressing sustainability issues, are promulgated and adopted by the GOT promulgated • GOVs promulgate (IWRM) reforms • The GOVs jointly implement a transboundary sub-basin agreement for equitable water-energy-cost sharing • Investment strategies, plans and/or financial policies promulgated • SEA carried out for key documents as a part of their preparation	• Council of WUA in place, reform under implementation • 3 laws adapted, last by end this year • Reform in process to be finalised on short term • In process, increased agreement • Inventory carried out, standard for the country • Not applied, not relevant	and Sanitation (RWSS) Demonstration Project	TJK	and NGO support	TOTAL: 1,626,000
			2.4 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP TJK	MWRI with NGO support services	
			2.5 Tajik Small-scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP TJK	MEI with NGO	
			2.6 Small Transboundary agreement (Tjk-part)	UNDP TJK	Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and, preferably, Uzbek authorities with Int. NGO support	
			2.7 Participatory International River Basin Management Processes (Tjk-part)	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities assisted by NGOs	
			2.8 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Tjk-part)	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	
			2.9 International River Basin Management Institutional Support (Tjk-part)	UNDP TJK	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities	

Outputs	Targets	Achievements	Activities	Implem. Body	Target groups	Input
Output 3: Transboundary dialogue in the Ili-Balkhash River Basin Indicators - transboundary coordination procedures - Documentation and database - Stakeholder / public engagement level Baseline: - reluctantly enforced framework agreement - Limited or un-systematic documentation - No RB management plan - No significant engagement of stakeholders	• Functional Commission and Working Groups • Regular bilateral meetings at political and technical level • Relevant documentation available in suitable database • River basin management activities • Regular engagement of key stakeholders and information of the public in transboundary matters	• Reached on KAZ level and well effective • Setting up new common water division works and training of KAZ in China. Confirmation 50-50 share • RBM plan for KAZ and database of historical data • RBM commission meeting and active deciding issues, carried out by third parties • All major stakeholder involved in the RBM commission • Regional court cases based on info on water law • Major industrial stakeholders working on water efficiency and treatment	3.1. Policy and institutional analysis	UNDP KAZ	Water Resources Committee, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Pilot projects TOTAL **791,000**
			3.2. Support to bilateral cooperation and joint activities	UNDP KAZ	Water Resources Committee, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council , Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, bordering regional administrations	
			3.3. Support to bilateral commission and framework agreements	UNDP KAZ	Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, Water Resources Committee	
			3.4. Coordinating and harmonizing water management activities & plans in the basin, stakeholders engagement	UNDP KAZ	Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, Water Resources Committee	

Outputs	Targets	Achievements	Activities	Implem. Body	Target groups	Input
Output 4: Regional Dialogue, IWRM Governance and Sector Capacity Building Indicators: - Regional sector and organization management capacity - Project implementation quality - Capacity for integrating environment and climate change issues into water management planning Baseline: - Limited sector and organization management capacity - Project implementation not yet started - Limited capacity for integrating environment into water management planning	• Regional sector and organization management capacity enhanced • Efficient & effective project implementation • Priority issues are discussed and regional documents are elaborated • Increased capacity for integrating environment and climate changes issue into water management planning • Strengthened transb. cooperation on water and climate issues • Jointly developed scenarios, documents are adopted • Relevant experience is disseminated and shared among all interested parties	• Common workshops • Not measurable • Elaborated • Increased capacity • Climate change assessment KAZ/KGZ • Joint Climate change assessment KAZ/KGZ • With China no common RBM plans, agreements raised on national part • Common trainings and meeting, common water division works carried out • Principle of water sharing confirmed	4.1: Project Management and Coordination, Support to Bilateral Cooperation 4.2: Regional Dialogue and Water Governance 4.3: Sector Capacity Building 4.4.: Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms	UNDP BRC	MAWR, MWRI, Bilateral Commission, Regional bodies, resources institutions and think tanks, NGOs and local authorities	UNDP Staff Intl. consultants Capacity building workshops Travels Additional TRAC resources required: Intl. consultants – tech. Final Seminar Capacity building seminar TOTAL 1,426,000
TOTAL						4,400,000

Annex G Evaluation Question Matrix

EVALUATION QUESTIONS (to be finalised)

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
Relevance: How does the project relate to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
Is the project relevant to international conventions and objectives	Does the project relates to the Aral Basin		
Is the project relevant to the UNDP country plans and strategies			Project documents Interviews UNDP teams
Is the project relevant to the countries development objectives			Document analysis Interviews UNDP team
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	- Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? . - Institutional capacity in place for RBM - Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in WUA is improved	- See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	- How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? - What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? - Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	- Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design - Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues - Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	- What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? - What changes could have been made (if		

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
	any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?		
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	- How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? - What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? - Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	- Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design - Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues - Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	- What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? - What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?		
Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?			
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? - Institutional capacity in place for RBM - Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in WUAs is improved	See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	- Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? - Did the project logical frame- work and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? - Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? - Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? - Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) - Did the leveraging of funds (cofinancing) happen as planned? - Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? - Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? - How was results-based management used during project implementation?	- Availability and quality of financial and progress reports - Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided - Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures - Planned vs. actual funds leveraged - Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations - Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost - Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) - Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency - Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives	
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	- To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? - Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?	- Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, - Examples of supported partnerships - Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained	

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
	- What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? - Which methods were successful or not and why?	- Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized	
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	- Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? - Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? - Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?	- Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts - Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity	
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	- What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? - How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc…)? - What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?		
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	- Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? - Did the project logical framework and work	- Availability and quality of financial and progress reports - Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided	

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
	plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? - Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? - Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? - Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) - Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? - Were financial resources utilized efficiently? - Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? - Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? - How was results-based management used during project implementation?	- Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures - Planned vs. actual funds leveraged - Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations - Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infra- structure and cost - Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) - Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency - Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives	
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
	Is the water efficiency raised?	Cubic meter per ha	
	Are project activities transferred to third parties or consumers	Project activities transfered	
	Project approaches settled in state	Budgeting agreed	

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
	financing?		
	Project approaches fixed in official procedures?	Procedures agreed	
	Income of land users increased due to more effective water use	Agricultural statistics, farmers information	
	Is the water sharing improved?		
	In how far are the consumers paying for water?	Water payment system	
	Are the participants in the basin councils active involved?		
	Are the participants in the basin council taken measures themselves?		
	What other corrective measures were adopted		
	Are the project pilots being scaled up?	Replication activities	
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Had the project environmental impact?	Is the water sharing improved?	Water division points improved	
	Is the water saving measurable?	Water use information	
	Is the scale of the project of such a size that environmental impact would be measurable		
	Are there indicators which are indicating potential environmental improvement?	Water quantity and quality	
	Has the water management been improved?	Procedures / decisions	
	Is the individual water use degreased?	Irrigation information	

Annex H Logframes

Logframe UNDP format

Intended Outcome as per Regional Program for 2011-2013 - Focus Area: Energy and environment: Outcome 2: By 2013, regional, national and sub-national levels have improved capacity for sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources.					
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: 1. Number of legal and regulatory frameworks that address the sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources 2. Number of interventions resulting in integration (mainstreaming) of sustainable management of ecosystems and natural resources into countries' socio-economic development frameworks"					
Applicable Key Result Area (from 2008-11 Strategic Plan): Mainstreaming environment and energy; Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor **Regional programme outputs :** Adaptive water governance interventions supported at the regional, subregional, national and subnational levels / Environment and poverty issues integrated in national and subnational development planning and interventions / Regional-level interventions supported to assess, prioritize and address environment and security issues					
Partnership Strategy: UNDP will be supported by the European Commission and Norway, and work closely with the EC, UNECE and OECD under the "Common Framework for addressing Water Issues in CA"					
Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): ***Promoting IWRM and Fostering Transboundary Dialogue in Central Asia*** **/ AWARD ID: 56531**					
Outputs	**Targets**	**Activities**	**Implementing Body**	**Target groups**	**Input**
Output 1: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Kyrgyzstan Indicators: - Wheat yield - Adequate and sustainable management arrangements and instruments - Investments strategies, plans and/or financial policies - Number of investment strategies, plans and/or financial polices applying SEA in their elaboration process - No. of households provided with improved WSS services - nationally owned participatory implementation process - Transboundary sub-basin agreement - Policy reform processes **Baseline:** - Wheat yield < 3 T ha^{-1} - Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited participatory processes - No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans - No investment strategies, plans or financial policies - No TB agreements in effect - No institutional integration	• Wheat yield > 4 T ha-1 • Participatory assessment and diagnosis processes are adopted by GOK • Participatory processes, for prioritizing IWRM issues and solutions, adopted & mngt aspects implemented • Feasibility studies (FSs) are approved • About 200 extra households provided with improved WSS services. • Investment strategies, plans and/or financial policies promulgated • SEA carried out for key documents as a part of their preparation • Management arrangements, addressing sustainability issues, are promulgated and adopted by the GOK • GOVs promulgate (IWRM) reforms • The GOVs jointly implement a transboundary sub-basin arrangements for equitable water sharing	3.0. Support to IWRM implementation	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Pilot projects **TOTAL 332,000**
		1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Projects	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	Oblast and Rayon DWRs jointly with WUAs and NGO support	
		1.2 Kyrgyz Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	MAWR with NGO support	
		1.3 Kyrgyz RWSS Demonstration Project	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	Village CBOs with DWS and DSE and NGO support	
		1.4 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management (Kyr-part)	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and, preferably, Uzbek authorities with Int. NGO support	
		1.5 Participatory IRBM Processes (Kyr-part)	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities assisted by NGOs	
		1.6 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Kyr-part)	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	
		1.7 IRBM Institutional Reforms (Kyr-part)	UNDP Kyrgyzstan	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities	

Output 2: Developing and implementing IWRM Strategies in Tajikistan Indicators: - Wheat production - Adequate and sustainable management arrangements and instruments - Investments strategies, plans and/or financial policies - Number of investment strategies, plans and/or financial polices applying SEA in their elaboration process - No. of households provided with improved WSS services - nationally owned participatory implementation process - Transboundary sub-basin agreement - Policy reform processes Baseline: - Negligible wheat production - Unsuitable management arrangements; lack of management instruments; limited participatory processes - No investment strategies, plans or financial policies - No experience from applying SEA to water management related investment strategies, policies, plans - Initial Small-scale Hydropower investment strategy - No TB agreements in effect - No institutional integration	• Wheat prod demonstrated and adopted by farmers on 10% of the Demonstration service area • Participatory assessment and diagnosis processes are adopted by GOT • Feasibility studies (FSs) are approved • About 200 extra households provided with improved WSS services. • Participatory implementation process, addressing health/sustainability impacts of WSS service levels/project rules, is promulgated and adopted by the GOT • Participatory processes, for prioritizing IWRM issues and solutions, adopted & mngt aspects implemented • Investment strategies, plans and/or financial policies promulgated • SEA carried out for key documents as a part of their preparation • Management arrangements, addressing sustainability issues, are promulgated and adopted by the GOT promulgated • GOVs promulgate (IWRM) reforms • The GOVs jointly implement a transboundary sub-basin agreement for equitable water-energy-cost sharing	4.0. Support to IWRM development	UNDP Tajikistan	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Services - Studies Pilot projects TOTAL: 592,000
		2.1 Tajik Irrigation Demonstration Projects	UNDP Tajikistan	Oblast and Rayon OMAs jointly with WUAs and NGO support	
		2.2 Tajik Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP Tajikistan	MWRI with NGO support	
		2.3 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Demonstration Project	UNDP Tajikistan	Village CBOs with OMA and/or SUE and NGO support	
		2.4 Tajik Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP Tajikistan	MWRI with NGO support services	
		2.5 Tajik Small-scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies	UNDP Tajikistan	MEI with NGO	
		2.6 Small Transboundary Sub-basin management agreement (Taj-part)	UNDP Tajikistan	Local Kyrgyz, Tajik and, preferably, Uzbek authorities with Int. NGO support	
		2.7 Participatory International River Basin Management Processes (Taj-part)	UNDP Tajikistan	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities assisted by NGOs y	
		2.8 Other Priority Demonstration Projects (Taj-part)	UNDP Tajikistan	MAWR, MWRI and key stakeholders assisted by NGOs	
		2.9 International River Basin Management Institutional Support (Taj-part)	UNDP Tajikistan	MAWR, MWRI and local authorities	

Output 3: Transboundary dialogue in the Ili-Balkhash River Basin Indicators - transboundary coordination procedures - Documentation and database - Stakeholder / public engagement level Baseline: - reluctantly enforced framework agreement - Limited or un-systematic documentation - No RB management plan - No significant engagement of stakeholders	• Functional Commission and Working Groups • Regular bilateral meetings at political and technical level • Relevant documentation available in suitable database • River basin management activities • Regular engagement of key stakeholders and information of the public in transboundary matters	3.1. Policy and institutional analysis	UNDP Kazakhstan	Water Resources Committee, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission	UNDP Staff National consultants Meetings Travels Pilot projects
		3.2. Support to bilateral cooperation and joint activities	UNDP Kazakhstan	Water Resources Committee, Min. of Environm. Protection, Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council and River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, bordering regional administrations	
		3.3. Support to bilateral commission and framework agreements	UNDP Kazakhstan	Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, Water Resources Committee	
		3.4. Coordinating and harmonizing water management activities&plans in the basin, stakeholders engagement	UNDP Kazakhstan	Balkash-Alakol River Basin Council; Balkash-Alakol River Basin Organization, Kazakhstani-Chinese Joint Commission, Water Resources Committee	TOTAL **493,000**
Output 4: Regional Dialogue, IWRM Governance and Sector Capacity Building Indicators: - Regional sector and organization management capacity - Project implementation quality - Capacity for integrating environment and climate change issues into water management planning Baseline: - Limited sector and organization management capacity - Project implementation not yet started - Limited capacity for integrating environment into water management planning	• Regional sector and organization management capacity enhanced • Efficient & effective project implementation • Priority issues are discussed and regional documents are elaborated • Increased capacity for integrating environment and climate changes issue into water management planning • Strengthened transb. cooperation on water and climate issues • Jointly developed scenarios, documents are adopted • Relevant experience is disseminated and shared among all interested parties	4.1: Project Management and Coordination, Support to Bilateral Cooperation 4.2: Regional Dialogue and Water Governance 4.3: Sector Capacity Building 4.4.: Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms	UNDP BRC	MAWR, MWRI, Bilateral Commission, Regional bodies, resources institutions and think tanks, NGOs and local authorities	UNDP Staff Intl. consultants Capacity building workshops Travels Additional TRAC resources required: Intl. consultants – tech. Final Seminar Capacity building seminar TOTAL 1,155,000
TOTAL					4,400,000

Logframe EU format

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	The project is expected to foster transboundary dialogue in Central Asia through interventions at national level (mainly involving Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), and at transboundary level (mainly involving Kazakhstan and China).	Improved dialogue on IWRM in CA countries and at the regional level: number of joint initiatives, documents and activities; Improved statistics on water use, water supply&sanitation; Successful replication of IWRM approaches and techniques among CA countries; Bilateral cooperation and relevant agreements on transboundary waters are facilitated&signed, relevant joint management bodies are supported/or established.	Official documents/agreements; State Statistics Committees; Annual PRS implementation reports in Tajikistan and other relevant reports; Reports from water authorities on water use and access to safe water; Living standards survey.	Political will and state support to the project operations; Political and economic stability - at least at the current level; Absence of major disasters in the region; Sufficient level of cooperation among CA countries - at least at the current level.
Specific objectives	1. In **Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan** (Outputs 1 and 2) - to develop and implement integrated water resources management and water efficiency strategies/plans at national and basin level. Additionally - to develop sub-sector strategies/plans and demonstrate best IWRM practices in rural water supply and sanitation (RWSS), small hydropower (SHP) and irrigation efficiency through implementation of demonstration projects. Thirdly, to support IWRM implementation at water basin level, including in transboundary basins.	1. National targets/strategies/plans are developed and adopted by the relevant governmental bodies; 2. State financing is assigned to IWRM activities implementation on the national and basin level; 3. Sub-sector strategies, investments plans or other strategic documents are developed and adopted by the authorities 4. Demonstrations projects are implemented and under replication; 5. IWRM documents and processes at the water basin level established/running - including RBM Plans, agreements, functioning Water Councils, stakeholders groups or other as relevant.	1. Governmental documents and statistics; 2. State and regional budgets, financial statement for water-related activities; 3. Monitoring reports from demonstration projects and relevant local/district statistics; 4. Publications in media, meeting reports, surveys, interviews of project counterparts; 5. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 6. Project reports and documentation.	1. Governmental commitment to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to the demonstration projects implementation; 3. Available co-funding from state and regional budgets for project activities; 4. Sufficient cooperation and good will on transboundary level (for water basin IWRM).
	2. In the Ili-Balkhash River Basin (Output 3) - to foster transboundary dialogue and enhance cooperation between Kazakhstan and the People's Republic of China for improved management of the shared River Basin system and its resources.	1. A dialogue platform is established and information is exchanged both at government and river basin level; 2. Bilateral activities are agreed and coordinated under the Commission; 3. IWRM capacity building is supported; 3. Regularity in meetings, information exchange and other joint activities.	1. Governmental, Commission and river basin stakeholder documents - plans, protocols, agreements etc.; 2. Operational data exchange platform and related documentation; 3. Publications in media, meeting reports, surveys, interviews of project counterparts; 4. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 5. Project reports and documentation.	1. Government commitment and sufficient mandate of Commission members; 2. Stakeholder commitment and active participation; 3. Follow-up on responsibilities regarding data collection, management as well as data sharing; 4. Interest and involvement of Chinese counterparts in policy level dialogues, info exchange and other collaborative actions.

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	3. At a pan-regional level (Output 4) - to build regional capacity and provide adequate expert support to project processes and relevant regional institutions to ensure efficient and effective project implementation, pan-regional coordination of activities (in and outside the scope of this project), as well as policy advise and platform for IWRM dialogue at regional level, addressing climate change issues via IWRM tools and instruments.	1. IWRM Dialogue is supported at the regional level; 2. Capacity building program is designed and some measures are implemented; 3. Coordination of water-related interventions is improved at the regional level; 4. IWRM national and transboundary interventions under the project are harmonized and relevant experience exchange is functional; 5. IWRM-related and water cooperation documentation is addressing climate change issues.	1. Regional/governmental documents, agreements and statistics; 2. Publications in media, meeting reports, surveys, interviews of project counterparts; 3. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 4. Project reports and documentation.	1. Regional/governmental commitment to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to supporting regional activities; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on regional level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses at CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply etc.) to allow IWRM implementation; 5. Sufficient commitment and capacity of relevant regional institutions.
Expected results	The national/sectoral activities (**under outputs 1 & 2**) will aim at two sets of key results:			
	1. Realistic national targets, strategies, investment plans and financial policies, which will be informed by the results of demonstration projects (next result).	1. National targets, strategies, investment plans and financial policies developed and approved (in RWSS, SHP and irrigation) - relevant state decrees or protocols in/by 2012; 2. State funding is assigned to their implementation - at least 50% of proposed costs is covered from the state budget; 3. External funding is identified (with confirmed state inputs) by the end of the project; 4. IWRM Dialogue is ongoing at the national level in coordination with NPD and relevant strategies/plans are adopted.	1. Governmental documents, plans, strategies and statistics; 2. State and regional budgets, financial statement for water-related activities; 3. Confirmed donor commitments/protocols; 4. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 5. Project reports and documentation.	1. Governmental reforms do not endanger the functional responsibilities of state agencies/ministries; 2. Constant/predictable tax, tariff and pricing policies and regulations; 3. Political/economic situation is stable enough to plan funding, including external.
	2. Demonstration projects that inform practical management instruments and feasibility studies and can be scaled-up and replicated, based on available national, donor or private sector funding.	1. Increased number of people in demo projects with improved access to drinking/irrigated water - at least 5000 in 2012; 2. Increased capacities for water measuring/allocation - i.e. expanded monitoring parameters list and frequency of sampling, agreed data-exchange protocols in 2012; 3. Percentage of project costs covered by recipient communities - at least 20%; 4. Improved quality of water in pilot locations; 5. Number of agreed locations for replication - at	1. State/regional/district statistics; 2. Healthy lifestyle centre reports; 3. Data from State Sanitary and Epidemiological Inspection; 4. Water monitoring data; 5. Financial commitment/funding from external donors - agreements signed and funded; 6. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 7. Project reports and documentation.	1. Governmental reforms do not endanger the functional responsibilities of regional/district/local authorities; 2. Constant/predictable tax, tariff and pricing policies and regulations; 3. External funding is available; 4. Regional/local capacities are enough to maintain improved infrastructure; 5. Maintenance/keeping costs are borne by local/regional budgets or investors; 6. Existing preconditions for replication -

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		least 5 during the project implementation; 6. Adequate funding is mobilized for demonstration projects (amount TBC based on technical documentation/feasibility studies); 7. Potential funding is identified for replication and scale-up of demonstration projects by the end of the project duration.		such as legal framework, financial means etc.
	Basin-level results (under outputs 1 & 2) are:			
	3. Development and implementation of: (i) a joint management arrangements – for equitable water, energy and O&M cost sharing – in Isfara transboundary sub-basin; (ii) context-specific participatory IWRM processes - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers; (iii) context-specific institutional reforms - Chu-Talas and Isfara rivers.	1. Interstate agreement/protocol and commission/working group exist for small transboundary sub basin - at least 1 agreement and 1 joint body by the end of 2012; 2. IWRM bilateral process is ongoing - joint activities/operations in the selected river basins are agreed and partially implemented in 2012; 3. Data-exchange process is facilitated and supported - documentation on relevant activities is available; 4. Stakeholders engagement and support is ensured - WUAs support, public meetings etc.	1. Joint management agreement/documentation officially endorsed and formalised; 2. Minutes, protocols and relevant records from the official meetings; 3. Context-specific institutional reforms are approved by responsible state agencies - state regulations or laws; 4. Publications and information in independent mass-media; 5. Reports/minutes/documentation from joint activities and meetings; 6. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 7. Project reports and documentation.	1. Political will on both sides of the border; 2. Equitable economical and legislative rules in both countries for costs-sharing provisions; 3. Existing legal frameworks/possibilities on the national level; 4. Bilateral relations are at least at the current level of cooperation.

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	In Ili-Balkhash basin (output 3):			
	4. Intensified bilateral cooperation activities and stakholders engagement	1. Joint data base established (% of improvement in knowledge of key river basin data, number of agreed factors/shared data); 2. Agreed IBB Management Plan is prepared in 2012 and endorsed by the Water Basin Council; 3. Number of engaged stakeholders on the basin level - at least 20 during the project duration; 4. Number of government agencies and stakeholders involved in basin data collection - at least 20; 5. Number of joint activities or actions taking place - at least 5 activities annually; 6. Frequency of communication and updates to the data base -at least monthly.	1. Minutes, protocols and relevant records from the meetings; 2. Data base records and web-site information; 3. Publications and information in independent mass-media; 4. Jointly approved reports/provisions and documented measures; 5. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 6. Project reports and documentation.	1. Political will on both sides of the border; 2. Existing legal frameworks/possibilities on the national level; 3. Bilateral relations are at least at the current level of cooperation or improving; 4. Project experts and partners are actively involved in the process.
	5. Improved base for cooperation (such as provisions for the water-sharing agreement and raised capacities of the Commission, basin authorities and stakeholders)	1. Regular Commission meetings are held and expert work groups are established (number of the meetings, frequency, list of participants - i.e. equitable participation); 2. Legal framework is improved and operational - officially endorsed documents and agreements; 3. Financial sustainability of cooperation - amount of annual contributions to IBB-work from governments and its trends; 4. IWRM activities are promoted in the basin and on the national level; 5. Capacities of the Commission, CWR, BABI, WBC and other stakeholders are raised - improved provisions, procedures, expertise (number of developed joint documents and new activities).	1. Minutes, protocols and relevant records of the Commission; 2. Number of joint reports/harmonized data; 3. Publications and information in independent mass-media; 4. Jointly approved reports/provisions and documented measures; 5. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 6. Project reports and documentation.	1. Political will on both sides of the border; 2. Existing legal frameworks/possibilities on the national level; 3. Bilateral relations are at least at the current level of cooperation or improving; 4. Stakeholders are actively involved in the process.

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	At the regional level (**output 4**)			
	6. Improved capacities of national and sub-regional stakeholders in IWRM activities	1. Capacity building program/priorities and its support is agreed with partners; 2. Number of trainings and seminars (at least 5), and participants (at least 200); 3. Improved knowledge and skills - at least 75% of the training participants have noted it in the evaluation forms; 4. Documentation on best practices and techniques - at least 3 publications/reports by the end of the project.	1. Regional/governmental documents, agreements and statistics; 2. Publications in media, meeting reports, surveys, interviews of project counterparts; 3. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 4. Project reports and documentation.	1. Regional/governmental commitment to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to supporting regional activities; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on sub-regional level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses on CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply etc.) to allow IWRM implementation.
	7. Sub-regional dialogue on IWRM implementation and addressing climate change issues under IWRM frameworks	1. Number of studies/expert reports/recommendations on IWRM - at least 4, documented and agreed; 2. Number of agreed measures/approaches on the regional/transboundary level - at least 3, documented; 3. Number of relevant seminars - at least 3; 4. Number of seminar participants - at least 100; 5. Regional statements/commitments initiated by the project - at least 2 by the end of the project.	1. Regional/transboundary state documents, agreements and statistics; 2. Publications in media, meeting reports, surveys, interviews of project counterparts; 3. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 4. Project reports and documentation.	1. Regional/transboundary govt. commitments to IWRM activities and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to supporting regional activities; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on sub-regional level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses and issues on CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply, climate change etc.) to allow IWRM implementation.
	8. Effective project management and implementation of project activities	1. IWRM national and transboundary interventions under the project are harmonized - joint documents and activities (at least among Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan); 2. Project documentation and reports delivered in time; 3. Work-plans are timely communicated and endorsed by key stakeholders; 4. Coordination platform is owned and supported by adequate regional bodies, functioning and updated - at least monthly updates; 5. Project web-site is regularly updated (monthly).	1. Regional/governmental documents, agreements and statistics; 2. Publications in media, meeting reports, surveys, interviews of project counterparts; 3. Mid-term and final evaluation reports; 4. Project reports and documentation.	1. Regional/governmental commitment to IWRM dialogue and activities, and reforms implementation; 2. Donors commitments to coordination and cooperation on the regional level; 3. Sufficient cooperation and good will on the regional/transboundary level; 4. Sufficient integration among different water uses and issues on CA level (irrigation, energy, water supply, climate change etc.) to allow IWRM implementation.

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Activities	***Key activities by results:*** *for more information, please, refer to the project work plan*	***Means:***	***Inputs:*** *for more information, please, refer to the project budget*	***Pre-conditions:***
output 1:	1.0. Support to IWRM implementation 1.1 Kyrgyz Irrigation Demonstration Project 1.2. Irrigation Investment Strategies, Plans and Financial Policies 1.3. Kyrgyz Rural Water Supply and Sanitation DemoProject 1.4: Small Transboundary Sub-basin management arrangements on river Isfara 1.5: Participatory Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) Processes 1.6: Other Priority Demonstration Projects 1.7: International River Basin Management (IRBM) Institutional Reforms	Strategic and financial documents with active stakeholders engagement and expert support; Technical and expert support to National Water Coordinating Committee; Support to national strategies, planning and implementation (RWWS, Irrigation, Climate Change); Meetings, consultations, seminars at different levels and in different locations; Feasibility studies, preparation of the technical documents; Monitoring and replication reports; Joint operations and activities such as monitoring, data exchange etc.; Bilateral legal documents/agreements and their approval; Bilateral functioning Commission or other relevant body; Visibility and public documents, reports, information sharing.	Type of costs: 1. Human resources and DSA; 2. Transportation/travel; 3. Equipment; 4. Running/office costs; 5. Visibility &services; 6. Administrative costs	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.
output 2:	2.0. Support to IWRM development 2.1 Irrigation pilot 2.2. Irrigation invest. Plans 2.3. Rural WSS pilot 2.4. RWWS Investment strategies, plans and financial policies 2.5. Tajik Small-Scale Hydropower (SSH) Investment Strategies, plans&policies 2.6. Arrangements on management of the small transboundary sub-basin 2.7. Participatory International River Basin Management Processes	Strategic and financial documents with active stakeholders engagement and expert support; Technical and expert support to National Water and Energy Council; Support to water reform, relevant strategies, plans and their implementation (RWWS, SHP, Irrigation); Developing IWRM documentation, its endorsement and follow up; Meetings, consultations, seminars at different levels and in different locations; Feasibility studies, preparation of the technical documents; Monitoring and replication reports;	Type of costs: 1. Human resources and DSA; 2. Transportation/travel; 3. Equipment; 4. Running/office costs; 5. Visibility &services; 6. Administrative costs	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.

	Intervention logics	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
	2.8. Other priority demonstration projects 2.9. International River Basin Management Institutional Support	Joint operations and activities such as monitoring, data exchange etc.; Bilateral legal documents/agreements and their approval; Bilateral functioning Commission or other relevant body; Visibility and public documents, reports, information sharing.		
output 3:	3.1. Policy and inst. Analysis 3.2. Support to bilateral cooperation and joint activities 3.3. Support to operations of the bilateral commission and agreements 3.4. Coordinating water management activities in the basin, stakeholder engagement, contributing to IWRM on the national level	Stakeholders meetings, incl bilateral; Information-sharing platform; Joint activities/capacity building/trainings on all levels; Expert group creation/support under the Commission; Reviews and analysis; Commission documents, workplans, procedures etc. well-elaborated; Legal support to joint cooperation - improved bilateral agreement/s; Development of River Basin Management Plan, endorsed; Water Basin Council meets regularly, improved basin-level cooperation.	Type of costs: 1. Human resources and DSA; 2. Transportation/travel; 3. Equipment; 4. Running/office costs; 5. Visibility &services; 6. Administrative costs	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.
output 4:	4.1. Overall Project Management and coordination 4.2. Regional Dialogue and Water Governance 4.3. Sector Capacity Building 4.4. Addressing Climate Change via IWRM process and mechanisms	Regional stakeholders meetings and seminars; Expert support on the regional and transboundary level - to EC IFAS and other structures and bodies on IWRM and climate change issues; Information-sharing platform - web-site, CAWSCI, WaterWiki; Joint activities/trainings; Reviews, analysis, reports on the CA and transboundary levels; Coordination activities; Knowledge management and experience exchange.	Type of costs: 1. Human resources and DSA; 2. Transportation/travel; 3. Equipment; 4. Running/office costs; 5. Visibility &services; 6. Administrative costs	1. State support to project operations; 2. Sufficient cooperation among countries, state agencies and stakeholders; 3. Confirmed funding conditions; 4. Commitment to IWRM on different levels.

United Nations
Development Programme
Regional Center
for Europe and Central Asia
Almaty office
67 Tole bi
050000 Almaty
Kazakhstan,
Tel. 7 727 2582643
Fax 7 727 2582645

www.centralasia.iwlearn.org

and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources
s, working with them on their own solutions to global and national
the people of UNDP and our wide range of partners