

STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE IN MONGOLIA --
PHASE II

ATLAS ID 61190

Project ID 00077410

Evaluation time frame: October – November 2013

Report Date: March 25 2014

United Nations Development Programme
Mongolia

Implementing Partner: Ministry of Environment and Green Development

Other project partners: UNEP, AusAid

Evaluation Team:

Erdenetsetseg Divaa (National Evaluator)
Maria Onestini (International Evaluator)

Acknowledgements

The evaluators would like to thank Bunchingiv Bazartseren, UNDP CO Environment team leader, and Khandarmaa Davaajamts, national coordinator of the “Strengthening environmental governance in Mongolia” Phase II, for their support at all stages of the evaluation. The evaluators would like to acknowledge and thank all of the persons who have generously and kindly provided their time, insights and inputs throughout this evaluation process.

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

AYAD	Australian Youth Ambassador for Development
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
ADB	Asian Development Bank
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organization
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CSO	Civil society organization
EA	Environmental auditing
GoM	Government of Mongolia
MEGD	Ministry of Environment and Green Development
MNET	Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEX	Nationally Executed Projects
NGO	Non-Government Organization
POPs	Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
ProDoc	Project Document
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations	3
i. Executive Summary	7
Project Summary Table.....	7
Executive Summary	8
Brief Project Description.....	8
Summary of purpose and relevance of the evaluation and key aspects of evaluation approach and methodology.....	9
Summary findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.....	11
1. Introduction.....	16
Purpose and relevance of the evaluation	17
Scope and Methodology.....	17
Structure of the evaluation report.....	20
2. Project description and development context	21
Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project: Phase I: Description of the Intervention and Brief Assessment	22
Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (Phase II): Project Description ...	26
Project start and duration	26
Problems that the project sought to address	26
Immediate and development objectives of the project.....	26
Baseline Indicators Established.....	26
Main stakeholders	27

Expected Results	28
3. Findings.....	29
3.1 Project Design / Formulation	29
Analysis of Logical Framework /Results Framework: Project logic, Strategy, Indicators	29
Assumptions and Risks	29
Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design.....	31
Planned stakeholder participation	31
Replication approach.....	31
UNDP comparative advantage	33
Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector	34
Management arrangements, UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation execution coordination, and operational issues	36
3.2 Project Implementation	37
Adaptive management.....	37
Partnership arrangements	38
Feedback from monitoring and evaluation activities used for adaptive management	38
Project Finance and Information on Disbursement during the Implementation Period...	39
Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation.....	40
3.3 Project Results.....	41
Overall results	41
Relevance	45
Effectiveness and Efficiency	46
Country ownership	47
Mainstreaming.....	49

Sustainability.....	50
Effect.....	52
Adaptive management for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project	53
4. Conclusion and Ratings, Recommendations, Best Practices and Lessons Learned.....	54
Conclusion and Ratings.....	54
Rating Scales for Different Criteria	55
Recommendations for future directions underlining main objectives and actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project	55
Best practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.....	60
Best practices	60
Lessons learned	60
5. Annexes.....	62
Project Logical Framework Extracted From Project Document	63
Rating Scales for Different Criteria	67
ToR National Consultant.....	68
ToR International Consultant	76
Itinerary and Mission Agenda	84
List of documents reviewed	86
List of Persons Interviewed.....	88
Evaluation Questionnaire	89
International Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form	90

i. Executive Summary

Project Summary Table

Per the Project Document (ProDoc), the following are the project summary tables.

Actual project finance data and information on disbursement during the implementation period is included in the body of this report.

Programme Period:	2010-15	Total resources required	US\$ 1512920.43
Key Result Area (Strategic Plan): Environment and sustainable development		Total allocated resources:	US\$ 412445.08
Atlas Award ID:	61190	Regular	US\$ 412445.08
Start date:	16 February 2011	Other:	
End Date	31 December 2013	AusAID	US\$ 380000
PAC Meeting Date	24 January 2011	GoM	US\$ 12920.43
Management Arrangements: National Execution Modality (NEX)		Gov of UK	US\$ 80000
Executing agency	United Nations Development Program	Unfunded budget:	US\$ 820000
Implementing agency:	Ministry of Environment and Green Development		627554.92
		In-kind Contributions	
		AYAD	US\$ 48,000
		MNET	US\$ 50,000

Executive Summary

Brief Project Description

Mongolia has made impressive steps forward in developing its economy since the transition period of the early 1990s. In 2011 and 2012 Mongolia was the fastest growing economy in the world. In 2011 GDP growth reached 17.5 per cent while in 2012 the growth figure was 12.3 per cent. Mining is the engine of Mongolia's economic growth. However, as is the case in many developing countries, quick growth is causing conflicts with environmentally – oriented policies and causing negative environmental effects. Studies have shown that air pollution is very high in urban areas, that land degradation is being caused by overgrazing, climate change and other development pressures, and that biodiversity is declining.

Between 2007 and 2010, the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism¹ partnered with UNDP to implement the *Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project*, with financial support from the Royal Government of the Netherlands and UNDP Mongolia (this being Phase I of the project). The objective of this project was to assist the Government of Mongolia to “*improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth; make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature*”.

Building upon Phase I's achievements and outcomes, as well as attempting to fill the identified gaps, Phase II of the Project was designed and implemented. Overall, the primary goal of this second Phase was to assist the Government of Mongolia to achieve its objective to “*Improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth;*

¹The Ministry, after political restructuring, is now called Ministry of Environment and Green Development.

make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature“.

It was proposed that Phase II of the project would address environmental governance issues by focusing on three interrelated outputs that would attempt to:

- (1) Streamline and strengthen Mongolia’s environmental legislative framework;
- (2) Strengthen environmental mainstreaming mechanisms; and,
- (3) Strengthen NGOs and CSOs capacity to engage in environmental governance processes.

It was planned that this would be operationalized through different Outputs, as listed below:

- *Output 1: Road map developed to harmonize and strengthen Mongolia’s environmental legislative framework.*
- *Output 2 Environmental Mainstreaming Mechanisms developed for adoption by government*
- *Output 3: Resource Mobilization strategy for Environmental NGOs/CSOs is developed.*

The project’s Phase II was implemented from 2011 to 2013 in the national execution modality (NEX).

Summary of purpose and relevance of the evaluation and key aspects of evaluation approach and methodology

As all UNDP – guided final evaluations, the objectives of this exercise are to determine if and how project results were achieved, and to draw useful lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. Regarding the relevance of this current evaluation, it is directly related to the basic value of the evaluation for UNDP and national stakeholders as well as for beneficiaries. The relevance therefore is accountability of achievements and the learning potential that this evaluation can have for future programming mainly within UNDP’s country office in Mongolia or for follow up activities to the Environmental Governance Project.

The final evaluation has centered upon products and processes and has followed UNDP guidelines for conducting this sort of outcome oriented evaluations. The evaluation focused

primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project, including the following overall scope:

- Assessment of the project in its entirety and its appropriateness and effectiveness in the context of promoting stronger Governance arrangements over five year period.
- Consideration of the long term impact of the Project and Lessons Learnt for future project design.
- Assessment in reaching the intended outcomes.
- Assessment of the relationships fostered between aid organizations and the Ministry of Environment and Green Development.
- Assessment of the activities and their respective effectiveness and efficiency.
- Observations about whether the project was effective in capacity building within the Ministry of Environment and Green Development.

The review has also taken a broader view of a range of other issues, including the processes of partnership funding and specific Government funds. The evaluation has followed methods and approaches as stated in UNDP Manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials. The assessment was framed using criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used: document analysis, key informant interviews, and questionnaire. The unit of analysis for this evaluation is the project itself, understanding this to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document and in associated modifications made during implementation

Summary findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Summary Findings

Overall, the project has been satisfactory given that, concisely, it can be stated that it has improved governance in environmental issues in the country given that the following aims have been achieved: streamlining and strengthening Mongolia's environmental legislative framework; strengthening environmental mainstreaming mechanisms; and, strengthened NGOs and CSOs capacity to engage in environmental governance processes. Furthermore, among outcomes and achievements obtained, the following can be specifically highlighted: streamlining governance instruments, strengthening governance structures within the national Mongolian government, generating capacity within governmental structures, as well as generating capacity in civil society groups to deal with environmental governance issues in the country.

The outcomes mentioned above are linked to processes and products. The present review process has found that several activities and products were implemented in order to mainstream environmental issues and fortify governance; among them the following can be highlighted: a road map to revise management of environmental laws, support in drafting several environmental laws and regulations, activities for the institutionalization of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Auditing (EA), drafting the structure, mandate and job descriptions for departments and divisions of the Ministry of Environment and Green development, preliminary study of risk assessment of climate change on environment and socio - economy in Mongolia, training workshops in climate change mainstreaming at national and provincial level, design and implementation of studies on the cost benefit model for mining of Mongolia, together with training manual for the implementation of CBA studies, capacity building activities of civil society representatives, consultation workshops with different stakeholders and national / local actors regarding different aspects of environmental governance, and the development of Green Development strategy and action plan. In summary, the above processes and products connects with outcomes and effects that the Project has had in Mongolia.

Summary Conclusions

Overall the findings and conclusions regarding the *Strengthening Environmental Governance Project (Phase II)* is that it has attained objectives through products and activities implemented as well as through results, outcomes and effects. This is explicit regarding Phase II but also including some aspects of Phase I where pertinent. This has been a successful project implementing expected outputs to a great degree and generating outcomes. As summarized in the ratings below, the Project has been a positive intervention, with only minor problems surfacing throughout its implementation.

Ratings for Different Criteria ²

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

²Rating scales for different criteria are included in the different sections of this report where criteria are referred to and in Annexes.

Summary Recommendations

A series of process and thematic recommendations are drawn for future direction and programming, which are summarized as follows:

Generate capacity and mainstream environmental governance issues besides the national level. In order to mainstream environment and development issues in policies and governance, it would be helpful if future interventions could work intensively in mainstreaming environmental governance issues and generating capacity at other levels of governance besides the national level.

Increase capacity, training, research and formal education in environmental law. In order to be able to effectively implement environmental policies and norms, there is a strong need to further formal education in environmental law at the university and graduate level. Improvement of the law education system would also be helpful in order to generate a corps of national professionals in environmental legislation and governance.

Expand work already carried out to rural settings and organizations. Albeit the outcomes of both phases of the project are rather positive, it has been repeatedly suggested that they should be expanded to rural settings and to NGOS / CBOs / CSOs and journalists outside of the capital.

Capacity building in environmental auditing and strategic environmental assessment for experts. Further work in order to build and strengthen capacity for experts and officials is deemed as needed.

Capacity building for NGOs / CSOs / CBOs professionalization/ strengthening. Further work in order to build capacity for civil society organizations is deemed as needed. Not only in environmental auditing, assessment, and other similar matters but also to build capacity for advocacy and public participation in decision – making.

Develop materials, data bases, research, and products. A need for training materials, data bases, and research in issues related to environmental governance as well as more specific or technical issues is manifest. This can certainly add in reinforcing initial project benefits.

Continue work in capacity building and capacity strengthening in environmental governance at all levels in Mongolia. Although most certainly the project has made great strides in capacity building and capacity strengthening in environmental governance in the country (both at the governmental and non – governmental level), it is considered that there is still ample room to work in this matter in the country.

Effective implementation of environmental governance norms and policies. Gaps have been identified between the capacity built throughout the project and actual effective

implementation of environmental governance norms and policies. Further work in this area is recommended.

Mainstream environmental governance issues in and within other areas of government besides environment core ministry. In order to mainstream environment and development issues in policies and governance, it would be helpful if future interventions could work in mainstreaming environmental governance and environmental issues in other policy areas (ministries dealing with mining, with industry, with agriculture, with health, for example).

Mining issues and environmental governance. It is undeniable that mining is the main driver of the Mongolian economy and of the country's development process. It is also clear that the country does not hold at the moment the necessary tools and processes, or, in some cases even the technology to deal with mining within a context of green development as the nation aims to be embarked upon. Therefore, these are issues where further work is recommended.

Climate change. Thematically this is one the new issues that environmental governance is beginning to deal with in Mongolia, and therefore a strong entry issue for future work underlining and reinforcing the initial benefits of the Strengthening Environmental Governance project, including climate change adaptation and low carbon development.

Urban development, including urban pollution. Being Ulaanbaatar one of the cities with greatest levels of air pollution in the world, a thematic area that could most certainly be further developed is dealing with this issue in an integrated manner.

Green development. Mongolia has begun to take first steps to mainstream *green development* as a national strategy. It has been called forth that UNDP should aid the country in giving substance to this concept. Particularly, in light of new political debates on what this concept means for the nation and also to coherently and cohesively work with the donor community in defining and operationalizing this concept for the country.

Summary Lessons learned

The project has also left a set of *lessons learned*, such as the following. The inclusion of various types of stakeholders has been positive for the development of this project. The involvement of stakeholders from academia, non – governmental organizations, and the media (besides government stakeholders) has been positive not only to make the project inclusive but also to generate greater impact, effects and promote mainstreaming of environmental governance issues and the sustainability of effects in the medium to long term. A lesson learned, therefore, is that involvement of stakeholders is positive for the implementation process as well as for the generation of outcomes sustainable over time.

All sectors of government and of the State (other line and core ministries besides environment sectorial ministry, aimags, city governments, parliaments) should be involved from the very early stages of the project (from the design stage if possible) in order to mainstream environmental governance issues at all levels and at all areas of governments. A lesson learned

therefore is that projects are more effective if they would include all levels of environmental governance institutions.

Regarding civil society groups, it would also have been additionally helpful if civil society groups and non – governmental organizations as well as media from rural areas and aimags would have been included in the project as beneficiaries and stakeholders. Furthermore, a lesson learned is that capacity building is a process and projects should include not only adequate technical components but also adequate timing to incorporate in depth capacity, especially when dealing with decision – making and governance processes. Moreover, the lesson learned is that capacity building has been a very positive process and outcome in this project, however, further training and in – depth training is needed for some issues (not only of government officials but also of civil society). A further lesson learned is that studies and materials developed throughout the project are helpful, yet they are more susceptible to implementation and suitable if they are accompanied by a knowledge management process that makes them accessible and functional for most actors.

1. Introduction

Mongolia has made impressive steps forward in developing its economy since the transition period of the early 1990s. In 2011 and 2012 Mongolia was the fastest growing economy in the world. In 2011 GDP growth reached 17.5 per cent while in 2012 the growth figure was 12.3 per cent. Mining is the engine of Mongolia's economic growth. However, as is the case in many developing countries, quick growth is causing some conflicts with environmentally – oriented policies and negative environmental effects. Studies have shown that air pollution is very high in urban areas, that land degradation is being caused by overgrazing, climate change and other development pressures, and that biodiversity is declining.

Between 2007 and 2010, the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism³ partnered with UNDP to implement the *Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project*⁴, with financial support from the Royal Government of the Netherlands and UNDP Mongolia. The objective of this project was to assist the Government of Mongolia to “*improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth; make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature*”.

Within the context and guidelines of the UN Development Support Framework (UNDAF), UNDP and UNEP prepared a joint project for supplementary support to strengthen environmental governance in Mongolia, which aimed at more effectively coordinating the provision of UN support to the environment and fortify Delivering as One UN, as a complimentary project to the first phase. The ‘*Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project Phase II*’ was designed to address some of the environmental governance

³The Ministry, after political restructuring, is now called Ministry of Environment and Green Development.

⁴ This finally was a first segment of the project, or Phase I.

concerns faced by Mongolia and was funded by UNDP and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) with financial contributions from the Government of Mongolia. It began in 2011 and is expected to be concluded in December 2013.

Phase II of the project built upon the first phase's results and recommendations and generated complementarity between the projects outcomes and effects. The main focus of the project's Phase II was on:

- *Streamlining and strengthening of Mongolia's environmental legislative framework;*
- *Strengthening environmental mainstreaming mechanisms, and*
- *Strengthening capacity of NGOs/CSOs to engage in environmental governance processes.*

For each of these goals, products and activities were delivered, expecting to produce outcomes and effects.

Purpose and relevance of the evaluation

As all UNDP – guided final evaluations, the objectives of this exercise are to determine if and how project results were achieved, and to draw useful lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid to the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The latter is to be achieved mainly through the assembling of lessons learned and recommendations for future programming.

Regarding the relevance of this current evaluation, it is directly related to the basic value of the evaluation for UNDP and national stakeholders, as well as for beneficiaries. The relevance therefore is accountability of achievements (products, outcomes, effects) and the learning potential that this evaluation can have for future programming mainly within UNDP's country office in Mongolia or for follow up activity to the Environmental Governance Project.

Scope and Methodology

The final evaluation has centered upon products, processes, and outcomes and has followed UNDP guidelines on conducting this sort of outcome oriented evaluations. Within the exercise, besides outcomes and possible effects, issues and criteria such as country ownership, relevance, and sustainability were evaluated. As indicated in the Terms of Reference, the evaluation focused primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project, including the following overall scope:

- Assessment of the project in its entirety and its appropriateness and effectiveness in the context of promoting stronger governance arrangements over five year period.
- Consideration of the long term impact of the Project and lessons learnt for future project design.
- Assessment in reaching the intended outcomes
- Assessment of the relationships fostered between aid organizations and the Ministry of Environment and Green Development
- Assessment of the activities and their respective effectiveness and efficiency.
- Observations about whether the project was effective in capacity building within the Ministry of Environment and Green Development.

The review has also taken a broader view of a range of other issues including the processes of partnership funding and specific Government funds. It has also considered the level of community engagement, organizational development, and service - specific training.

The evaluation has followed a pre-established work plan, with the above overarching objectives in mind. The evaluation has followed methods and approaches as stated in UNDP manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials. The evaluation was framed using criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and effect. The criteria was be defined through a set of questions which were presented in the different methodological formats indicated below.

The analysis entailed evaluating different stages and aspects of the project, including design and formulation (aspects such as logical framework, budget/expenditures to date/co-financing as well as assumptions and risks); implementation; and results. It was carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular UNDP Country Office, project team, and key non-governmental stakeholders.

Regarding the evaluation's framework and methodology employed, and in order to carry out this evaluation exercise, several data collection tools for analyzing information from the perspective and the principles of results-based evaluation (including relevance, ownership, efficiency and effectiveness, sustainability). It was also intended that the methodologies implemented through specific tools feed into each other. Also, through a combination of methods used, feedback was sought between the various tools and validation between different levels and

types of data collection. These aggregation methods have also allowed triangulating the information, and thus ensuring the validity of the data that give rise to the evaluation process.

Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used:

- *Document analysis.* Analysis of documentations, such as project documents, project reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents. Furthermore other documents, such as publications originating from the project (study reports, media publications, etc.) were analyzed.
- *Key informant interviews:* Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officials, strategic partners of civil society / NGOs / beneficiary groups, and government actors. The interviews were carried out in person while the mission in Mongolia took place.
- *Questionnaire.* A questionnaire was e-mailed to all of those persons interviewed in order to validate data and information gathered through the personal interviews and in order to give stakeholders a chance to further input in the evaluation process. The questionnaire was also implemented to minimize as much as possible language barriers that could have arisen during the interviews.

The final evaluation timeframe was developed through three distinct but interconnected stages: preparation, mission, and report production. Before the mission to Mongolia, a first phase of preparation took place, mainly entailing acquaintance with an examination of project and project-related documents, as well as general acquaintance with project's context. Also at this stage, logistic and stakeholder interviews were established in collaboration with UNDP Mongolia and an inception report was drafted and discussed with UNDP. This inception report set the evaluation and the evaluation-report parameters.

A ten day mission took place from October 17th to October 30th, mainly to maintain meetings with relevant stakeholders in Mongolia, meetings with UN personnel and to review of materials with key stakeholders. After the mission, data validation and report writing took place, with submittal of draft reports to the project's coordination, UNDP staff, and relevant persons. Comments were collected and a final report drafted.

The unit of analysis for this evaluation is the project itself, understanding this to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document and in associated modifications made during implementation

Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation report is structured, following this methodological and evaluation scope section, with a second section that includes an overall project description within a developmental context. This section includes a description of the problems the project sought to address, as well as its objectives. Furthermore, indicators and main stakeholders involved in the projects are defined as a unit of analysis, as well as what were the expected results. Basically, this section deals with the design stage and design concept of the project.

A third core section of this report essentially deals with the evaluation findings, analytically observing the results framework, UNDP's comparative advantages, as well as linkages with other projects and interventions in the sector. Furthermore, this section also deals with findings relating to the actual implementation of the project, including strategic issues such as adaptive management and partnership agreements, as well as monitoring. This third section concludes with findings on actual project overall results and findings related to the criteria established for final evaluations such as relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, ownership at the national level, mainstreaming and sustainability. This section sees to, largely, the findings related to the implementation process.

A fourth core section of the present report entails overall conclusions as well as forward looking issues. For instance, this section includes lessons learned and best practices extracted from the project as well as recommendations for future actions and future projects. Lastly, an annex section includes project and evaluation documentation.

2. Project description and development context

Mongolia's environment and natural resources are exhibiting considerable pressures from a series of threats. These threats arise from increased mining, urban growth, land used practices, as well as from climate change.

As a basis for the original project design, data from an environmental vulnerability study carried out by UNDP in 2005 was used. This work revealed that environmental quality has decreased and environmental problems due to human impact have greatly increased and worsened since the early 1990s. This has been coupled with insufficient actions to implement environmentally sound policies. Particular, issues related to governability, such as the absence of transparency in decision-making relating to natural resource management, have been associated to the denial of the rights of vulnerable social groups to environmental services, and thus hindering the achievement of development goals.

What can be regarded as an early stage of environmental policy reform took place in the 1990s, which has resulted in the development of a substantial number of environmental laws, the ratification of most main multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), as well as the declaration of a substantial area of the country as part of the protected area system. Since the early 1990s there has also been an increased presence and strengthening of civil society groups in Mongolia, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

However, the numerous environmental problems the country is facing confirmed the need to review the institutional framework, and make strategic revisions to address all environmental problems and risks that have emerged in the past 20 years in an integrated and streamlined manner. According to the Project Document, it was indicated that –at the time of project design- - Mongolia's environmental norms have been developed and/or amended over the last two decades, with over 30 environmental laws approved in 20 years, as well as several hundred environmental regulations and bylaws. Mongolia has also developed a number of key policy documents (e.g. National Biodiversity Action Plan, Climate Change Action Plan) and joined 14 UN environment Conventions and Treaties, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Kyoto Protocol, as well as the Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), among others.

At the same, civil society has been strengthened in Mongolia in many ways. However, again as indicated in the Project Document, it is still in transition from the central planning model prevalent in the country until the late 1980s. As such, it has not achieved the standing of counteracting political force, neither has it had the independence and professionalization needed in order to operate as a counterbalancing sector of society and generate lasting impacts.

Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project: Phase I: Description of the Intervention and Brief Assessment

As stated before, the Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project (Phase II) built upon an earlier segment (Phase I). Phase I of the project was implemented from August 2007 to March 2010 whereby the environmental line ministry (then called Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism --MNET) partnered with the UNDP. The project had an overall funding of US\$1012291 (with support from the Government of the Netherlands of US\$ 856087, of US\$ 99,983 from UNDP, and from the MNET of US\$ 56220).

As indicated previously, although most certainly this evaluation concentrates upon Phase II of the project it does also consider, to a certain degree, Phase I. This is so for several reasons, mainly due to the fact that Phase II built upon the first segment and was a second stage of the project's first phase. Most certainly this emerged in the evaluation process, not only as regards to implementation process but also as how Phase II was perceived. That is, Phase II is perceived as a stage of a project and the two phases are inextricable, not only in a programmatic way but also in a conceptual manner.

As part of this earlier phase there were several outcomes such as a review of the national environmental legal framework, Mongolia's multiple environmental norms as well as an assessment of the implementation mechanisms of Mongolia's environmental management system, and an assessment of the institutionalization of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Auditing (EA). The following are the main products resulting from each of Phase I's Project components.

Component 1. Mongolia's Environmental Laws and the Status of the Environmental Conventions

- Mongolia's Environmental Laws, By Laws and Regulations Reviewed and All Gaps, Conflicts and Overlaps Identified; Recommendations for Improved Environmental Law Management Delivered.
- MNET Developed A Plan To Reform Thirteen Environmental Laws Between 2009-12 Based On Project Recommendations.
- Environmental Law Education System Assessed And Environmental Law Training Manual Developed.
- Draft Law on Payment for Negative Environmental Impacts Prepared.

- Eleven Multilateral Environmental Conventions, ratified by the Parliament of Mongolia, Officially Translated And Published, Making Them Formally Part Of The Mongolian Legislation For The First Time.
- National Climate Change Action Plan Updated And Committees On CC, CBD And CDD Re-Instated; A New Climate Change Structure Was Established Within Government.

Component 2. Implementation of Monitoring Mechanisms

- Policy on Strategic Environmental Assessment Developed Policy on Environmental Auditing Developed.
- Institutional Implementation Mechanisms for environmental management reviewed.
- Capacity building activities in environmental auditing and strategic environmental assessment

Component 3. Strengthening of NGOs / Civil Society / Media

- Engaging Civil Society in Policy Activities.
- CSOS / NGOS Capacity Development.
- Media Capacity Development.
- Information Disclosure Activities.

As stated earlier, the focus and scope of the present assessment is definitely Phase II, however due to the inextricable links between the two phases, and the general perception that it was basically one intervention in two stages, a sort of general assessment of Phase I can be drawn within the present report. Some of the same criteria used in the Phase II evaluation (relevance, sustainability) will be used for this overall assessment. Nevertheless, with the understanding that an ex post analysis more than three years after activities have concluded is unavoidably less profound than a full evaluation.

Phase I was a *highly relevant* project for Mongolia. The **relevance** of a project is defined by the degree to which its objectives are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies. In this case, it can be stated that the project was very relevant for Mongolia since at the design and implementation stages for this very first phase precise significant needs in streamlining environmental governance instruments as well as strengthening governance factors were identified. It must be indicated that the first stage was very much relevant (it can be said that even more so than the second stage in some

aspects) due to the fact that at that point the country's needs and requirements regarding environmental governance were much more acute. Phase I basically laid the ground work for relevance within the second stage in the sense that the products and processes that originate out of the first segment (norms, normative gap identification, work regarding international conventions) are the basis for the implementation processes strengthened in Phase II.

With regard to *effectiveness* (that is effectiveness described as the extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved) it can be stated that Phase I was *satisfactorily effective*. Recalling that the overall project objective for this segment of the project was to aid the Government of Mongolia to achieve its objective to *"Improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth; make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature"* it can be stated that, generally, objectives have been attained.

This project assessment glances at effectiveness from two interlinked approaches: products and outcomes. First, regarding the products and processes themselves, as indicated in the above listing of the different outputs, it can be stated that they have achieved products, approximately as outlined in the project design. That is, that a summary assessment can be made that a results – based process took place through the achievement of products. Second, that to a large degree expected outcomes were effectively reached given that the products have had an effect in Mongolia. Norms have been streamlined, gaps in environmental legislation have been identified, institutional capacity has been strengthened, personal capacities have been built-upon based on the process and products achieved and implemented, policy has been implemented: all of these are indicators that there have been outcomes reached as a result of meeting objectives and specific targets.

National ownership is assessed taking into account relevance of a project to national development and environmental agendas as well as recipient country's commitments. Regarding Phase I, commitments are manifested and observed as indicators that project outcomes have been mainstreamed, another gauge of national ownership. Phase I had a very strong national ownership. This is emphasized by several indicators that can identify ownership as well as mainstreaming. This is positively the case at the government level, but also at the non – governmental and civil society level. For instance, the institutionalization of governance mechanisms such as the establishment of areas within government that deal with environmental issues, as well as climate change, including strengthening institutional capacity indicates ownership within Phase I that was further anchored in Phase II. Furthermore, the upgrading of the main institution dealing with environmental matters (at that point the MNET) to a core ministry with increased capacity and augmented roles that took place in subsequent periods, to

some degree responded to the need to mainstream and strengthen environmental governmental structures. The latter being an issue identified in Phase I.

Phase II built heavily on the Phase I, but not only constructing upon what was achieved in the first section of the project but also trying to fill the gaps identified in the project's early stages as well as establishing processes to resolve mentioned institutional assessment gaps. This matter closely links to the *sustainability* valuation of Phase I. An ex post assessment, such as the one being done in this report for the project's initial segment, does not observe the possibility or prospect of sustainability in the typical manner that is carried out in an evaluation. Here a valuation of sustainability itself is done. By carrying out a second project stage that not only built upon the achievements of the first segment, but also tried to fill identified gaps, the sustainability factor of Phase I is deemed *highly satisfactory*. The fact that the second stage built upon what was achieved in the first stage is a clear indicator of sustainability given that the benefits of initiatives included in Phase I continued in Phase II and this ex post assessment several years after the first phase is finished attests to the sustainability factor resulting from the earlier stage.

Some of the issues identified that proved to be somewhat problematic or challenging for the implementation process in the first phase were political changes at the parliamentary and at the governmental executive levels, which caused delays in the implementation process. Furthermore, turnover of staff hindered continuity to some degree and again caused postponements in some of the process. Furthermore, funding emerged as an issue given that funds were not ample enough to implement all expected products and generate all aimed outcomes. This was one of the motives for implementing a second phase that pursued funding for the implementation of further activities and sought supplementary outcomes to those achieved in the first stage of the project. Also, in Phase I, some shortfalls were identified, including the involvement of local governments and civil society organizations in environmental governance. It is understood that the involvement of several environmental non-governmental organizations and other civil society groups in the second phase responded to this deficit, yet a breach in full involvement of non – national institutions still remains.

In summary, therefore, Phase I emerges through this ex post brief assessment as a relevant and effective project with proven sustainability of its outcomes several years after its closing. Phase I laid the groundwork for and identified the gaps addressed in Phase II. Although the first stage encountered some problems and difficulties regarding political momentum and lack of installed capacity, these issues were successfully retrieved in order to complete the project generating expected outputs and outcomes.

Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (Phase II): Project Description

Project start and duration

The project *Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (Phase II)* was implemented from April 2011 throughout December 2013.

Problems that the project sought to address

The specific problems the project sought to address were the lack of consistent policies for the protection, sustainable use and rehabilitation of natural resources. Furthermore, it sought to attend to the lack of transparent access to environmental information as well as weak public participation and monitoring of environmental issues in Mongolia.

Immediate and development objectives of the project

The project's overarching aim was to assist the Government of Mongolia to achieve its objective to *"Improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth; make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature"*.

The proposed project objective was to address environmental governance matters by focusing on three interrelated outputs, attempting to:

- (1) Streamlining and strengthening of Mongolia's environmental legislative framework;
- (2) Strengthening environmental mainstreaming mechanisms; and,
- (3) Strengthening capacity of NGOs/CSOs to engage in environmental governance processes.

Baseline Indicators Established

The Project Document specifies the baseline indicators as follows:

Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:

5.1.1 Indicator: number of domestic laws, regulations adopted or revised, to support United Nations conventions, e.g., Kyoto protocol

5.1.2 Indicator/target: implementation of MOUs/agreements between authorities on their responsibilities over natural resource management

5.2.1 Indicator: number of CBOs contributing to effective resource management; pastoral area under rotational grazing scheme, area of community reserved pastures, and irrigated pastures.

Furthermore, these are further specified as follows:

Expected outcome 1:

- Baseline: Gap analysis carried out on Mongolia's environmental laws, without formal strategy in place to revise environmental law management system.
- Indicators: Completion of Road Map to harmonize Mongolia's environmental legislative framework.

Expected outcome 2:

- Baseline: Draft concepts for Institutional framework for SEA and EA developed.
- Indicators: Complete documents for institutional framework for SEA and EA.

Expected outcome 3:

- Baseline: Environmental NGOs/CSOs lack strategy to generate sufficient resources to carry out their planned activities.
- Indicators: Number of environmental NGOs with resource mobilization plans in place.

Main stakeholders

Project main stakeholders have been (as planned and how it effectively occurred) governmental actors (that is, mainly the Ministry of Environment and Green Development of Mongolia) and non-state actors (such as the academic sector, civil society groups including national environmental non-governmental organizations).

Other stakeholders have been less involved. For instance, local and other sub – national governments as well as civil society groups in the aimags working at the local level.

Also, other areas of government outside of the environmental ministry have not been fully engaged in the project. Although it is understood that all government ministries were always invited to all workshops, seminars, and training events organized by the project, their involvement has not been as strategic as it would have been desirable.

Expected Results

The expected results of the project were:

- Road map developed to harmonize and strengthen Mongolia's environmental legislative framework.
- Environmental mainstreaming mechanisms developed for adoption by government.
- Resource mobilization strategy for environmental NGOs/CSOs is developed.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

Analysis of Logical Framework /Results Framework: Project logic, Strategy, Indicators

From the Project's Logical Framework (LF) the intended outcomes, implementation strategies, key assumptions, and indicators are established. The objectives of these components are to guide implementation and to be used to verify achievement of outcomes, planned outputs, and activities throughout the project's monitoring process. The complete framework is included as part of the Annexes (Project Logical Framework Extracted from Project Document).

An analysis of the LF indicates that the results analysis, strategy, indicators, and other components of the log framework have been suitable for the development of the project as well as for using the log frame as a monitoring tool. Recalling that the Project's Phase II overall intended outcome is *"A holistic approach to environmentally sustainable development is promoted and practiced for improving the well-being of rural and urban poor"*, specific project outcomes and their linked indicators and strategy are extracted as follows.

The general outcome indicators, as included in the framework, were:

- Number of domestic laws, regulations adopted or revised, to support United Nations conventions
- Implementation of MOUs/agreements between authorities on their responsibilities over natural resource management; and,
- Number of CBOs contributing to effective resource management; pastoral area under rotational grazing scheme, area of community reserved pastures, and irrigated pastures.

The project's logical framework and work plans were amply developed to include not only expected outcomes, but also outputs/products, activities and involved parties. It also included deliverables. All of the above constituted an amply adequate 'road map' to develop the project as well as to benefit from the framework as a monitoring tool to check against expected and actual outcomes.

Assumptions and Risks

Assumptions and risks are eventualities taken into account, as much as possible, in the project design stage. Within the design stage mitigating elements are also drawn in order to be able to confront these aspects as necessary. UNDP defines assumptions as "the necessary and positive conditions that allow for a successful cause-and-effect relationship between different

levels of results” and risks as “risks are potential events or occurrences beyond the control of the programme that could adversely affect the achievement of results”.⁵

A risk log was part of the design of the Project. In it several risk factors were included, the major ones being:

- Project may not succeed in mobilizing all required financial resources,
- Potential changes in key decision makers at the policy level or social unrest after 2012 elections (or earlier),
- Project may face challenges to involve national stakeholders beyond the Ministry in the project.

The first risk unfortunately did occur. However, further funding leveraged after the conclusion of this project will aid in completing some of the projected outcomes that were not completed due to lack of financial resources. The second risk did not occur at all. As will be seen in the sections on ownership and on sustainability, although there have been profound political changes (not only regarding key decision makers but in all of government and in the State, including Parliament), these have not impacted negatively upon the project. The new government officials and new key decision makers have continued to incorporate the project as part of its structure and of its policies. Unfortunately, also, and as it will be seen further on in this report, the third risk did occur.

⁵United Nations Development Programme, HANDBOOK ON PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS, 2009.

Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design

Collaboration with other relevant projects within the same or similar focal area was incorporated into the project design. As the ProDoc indicates, it was intended that the project would closely collaborate with ongoing and future donor and government projects that dealt with environmental governance. The ProDoc explicitly mentions the collaboration with the Netherlands-Mongolia Trust Fund for Environmental Reform (NEMO) project, that contains an environmental governance component, as well as the collaboration with other projects from different bilateral and multilateral donor agencies.

It is important to note that it was planned (and it occurred) that the Strengthening Environmental Governance (Phase II) project would work closely with ongoing and planned UNDP projects. These projects, also, included governance issues which, in turn, created positive synergies between the projects and at the implementation level.

Planned stakeholder participation

The project, at the design stage, included several steps to ensure comprehensive stakeholder involvement. Civil society involvement, including NGOs, was intrinsically weaved into the project design. For instance, one of the expected outcomes (number three) states “Resource Mobilisation strategy for Environmental NGOs/CSOs is developed”. The planned stakeholder participation was also weaved in as an expected output, expressed as: “(3) *Strengthening capacities of NGOs/CSOs to engage in environmental governance processes*”.

Planned stakeholder participation was also included in expected outcomes, and it was made explicit at the design stage. For instance, it was indicated that the project would assist environmental organizations in defining strategies to mobilize funding, in order to become less dependent from government and from other organizations. Also, it was planned that organizational management capacity would be fostered. Furthermore, the educational component of the Mongolian Press Institute on environmental issues was planned to be strengthened.

Replication approach

Replication, according to UNDP evaluation guidelines, occurs when activities, demonstrations and/or techniques are repeated within or outside the project. Replication can be considered when lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic areas, or, also, when lessons and experiences are replicated within the same area but funded by other sources. For instance, replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, national and regional forums, etc.).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand a project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions or areas.

Replication did occur in the sense that, for example, capacity building and training was expanded to other projects. For instance, non-governmental organizations and the media carried out their own follow up projects in capacity building and training in environmental governance (including training workshops, and the generation of knowledge management products) that built upon and expanded what was achieved in this project by these organizations. Furthermore, other aspects of the project were replicated outside of it. For example, the Press Institute mobilized funding from other donors in order to continue and strengthen the training and capacity building that was initiated through the Strengthening Environmental Governance Project.

The capacity built and the environmental governance improvements achieved, occurred through strengthened institutions in environmental governance replicating outcomes to other projects within the UN System, or through projects implemented by bilateral donors and multilateral development banks in Mongolia.

For instance, also, within the project document, specific mention to a replication approach was made, since it was indicated that a methodology to carry out the cost benefit analysis would be developed and that (following this methodology) a manual to develop cost – benefit analysis would be prepared. The manual was indeed developed and it helps in quantifying environmental and social costs of mining activities in Mongolia and is based on pilot cost-benefit analysis carried out in mining sites in Mongolia. Therefore, knowledge transfer (which, as indicated above is a replication approach) within the project (and expectedly beyond it) is taking place.

Potential further replication also exists given that the project can be considered an umbrella project dealing with broad aspects of Mongolian environmental governance issues. Its knowledge generating and capacity building aspects are prevalent in most if not all of future international donor projects that deal with environmental issues at a political or State level.

UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP has shown a number of comparative advantages in relation to the Strengthening Environmental Governance Project. First of all, and even as explicitly stated by some stakeholders, UNDP is perceived as representing and promoting a multilateral agenda via its cooperation projects in sustainable development, environment, and in governance. This is in comparison to some other donors that are perceived as promoting the agenda of their own country in cooperation projects; UNDP is perceived as not trying to impose a particular country's agenda.

The cross – sectorial mandate that UNDP signifies is also a key comparative advantage. That is, that UNDP promotes an approach that links development with an environmentally sustainable use of natural resources, which is seen as crucial for Mongolia (by State and non – state actors). This is given that the project is linked to poverty reduction, governance, and strategically supports key stakeholders in the optimal sustainable management of natural resources. The fact that the project is part of plans that are developed in conjunction between government and the UN System is also deemed a comparative advantage where the promotion of energy and environment sustainability and enhancing capacity for environmental governance at all levels is one of the key outcomes sought at the System – level.

UNDP's mandate is guided by its sustainable human development paradigm and this expresses its comparative advantage over other institutions that compartmentalize environment and / or development issues. For Mongolia, and in the context of the environmental governance project, this is crucial since the country expresses in national and international arenas the need to make compatible ecological issues with sought human development.

An overarching comparative advantage of UNDP is its emphasis in capacity building as an operational method. This is significant and strategic in this intervention since capacity building is at the very core of the project and of the reasoning behind it. This is so since it is the strengthening of capacity at governmental and non – governmental levels that is sought to improve environmental governance in Mongolia. As expressed by UNDP, the institution's comparative advantage in capacity building (and remembering that capacity building is a fundamental aspect within this project) comes from:

- Building on a human development value base and combining that with a strong conceptual framework and a methodology that is based on its years of experience on the ground in countries around the world;
- *Being in it for the long run.* Because of its long-standing system of working through Country Offices, UNDP is able to stay engaged for the duration of a programme and beyond so that it can engage continually and then track and measure the results of its capacity development

efforts. Since UNDP supports multiple programmes at any given time, it is able to provide capacity development support synergistically across all of these and reap economies of scale.⁶

Another comparative advantage in this case has been the key resources that can, and have been, harnessed and mobilized through UNDP in this project in its two Phases. By this is meant not only financial resources but just as importantly resources such as state of the art knowledge, key experts from outside Mongolia, and the general array of knowledge and assistance that is channeled through UNDP.⁷

Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

There have been two types of linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector. First of all, with regard to overarching or conceptual linkages. For instance this occurs in work with other donors or in up scaling (the latter whereby the projects achievements in upgrading environmental governance and capacity in the country are imbedded tacitly into other projects and programs). Second, more tangible or concrete linkages between governance issues and other projects or interventions within the sector took place. For example, with other UNDP projects in environment that incorporate environmental governance issues. These interventions, therefore, are mutually supportive with the Strengthening Environmental Governance project.

⁶ UNDP, Frequently Asked Questions: *The UNDP Approach to Supporting Capacity Development*, Capacity Development Group Bureau for Development Policy United Nations Development Programme, June 2009.

⁷ As stated in the document above, this is also an articulated UNDP comparative advantage “Drawing on knowledge, examples and experiences from around the world. Its presence in 166 countries, its strong research base, and a long institutional memory in each country allows UNDP to draw intra-regional and intra-country comparisons and facilitate South-South learning and exchange.”

Examples of the linkages are as follows, where outcomes and objectives of different UNDP projects in Mongolia have been linked conceptually and practically to governance in environment issues⁸:

- *Strengthening the protected area network in Mongolia (SPAN) UNDP Project, outcomes linked to environmental policy and governance:* (a) strengthened National policy, legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable management and financing of the national Protect Areas system; and (b) institutional and staff capacity and arrangements in place to effectively manage and govern the national PA system.
- *Building Energy Efficiency Project (BEEP) UNDP Project, outcomes linked to environmental policy and governance:* (a) energy saving policy in the construction sector of Mongolia is realized with higher degree of enforcement and application of a range of newly adopted energy efficiency technologies.
- *Ecosystem-based Adaptation Approach to Maintaining Water Security in Critical Water Catchments in Mongolia UNDP Project, outcomes linked to environmental policy and governance:* (a) integrating strategies and management plans for target landscapes and river basins; (b) adopting ecosystem-based adaptation strategies for specific landscapes and for River Basin Management Plans; (c) integrated landscape - level Ecosystem Based Adaptation management action plans; (d) strengthening capacities and institutions to support ecosystem – based adaptation strategies and integrated river basin management, their replication and mainstreaming in sector policies; and, (e) establishment of institutional structure for river basin management integrating climate change risks.

⁸ Some of these linkages are also relevant to Phase I.

- *ADB technical assistance project* - Support the drafting of recommendations to the regulation on strategic environmental assessment.
- *SDC project on capacity building of NGOs and civil society develop* the capacity of NGOs to represent effectively the interests of their members and constituencies and to promote good governance in Mongolia.

Management arrangements, UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation execution coordination, and operational issues

The project was implemented in the Nationally Executed Projects (NEX) format by the line ministry in charge of environmental issues within the Mongolian national government (originally called the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism –MNET— and that it changed its name to Ministry of Environment and Green Development –MEGD—after restructuring in the year 2012). UNDP guidelines and standards for NEX projects were followed, including program and operation policies.

A Project Management Unit (PMU) was operational since April 2011 in Ulaanbaatar and a Project Board was established. The PMU was composed of an overall Project Director, from within ministry, who was the focal point that provided overall guidance to the Project Management Unit members. The prescribed functions of the executing agency were:

- (a) Coordinating activities to ensure the delivery of agreed outcomes;
- (b) Certifying expenditures in line with approved budgets and work-plans;
- (c) Facilitating, monitoring and reporting on the procurement of inputs and delivery of outputs;
- (d) Coordinating interventions financed by GEF/UNDP with other parallel interventions;
- (e) Approval of Terms of Reference for consultants and tender documents for sub-contracted inputs; and,
- (f) Reporting to UNDP on project delivery and impact.

There was a high rotation of project directors, with three individuals appointed as such throughout the project's life span of three years. However, the changes in project board and project director, staffing, etc., did not overly affect meeting with project objectives and outputs in a timely manner, indicating a good level of adaptive management in order to implement the project.

Overall, it emerges that management arrangements functioned well, with satisfactory resources from partner counterparts and adequate project management arrangements in place at entry and throughout the project. Furthermore, structural changes and political shifts (that is change from a line ministry to a core one; elections held during project implementation and with subsequent political changes) did not affect the project negatively and continuity was achieved. The implementation in the NEX modality was satisfactory, and crucial for a project that deals almost exclusively with governance issues. This management arrangement was positive also in the sense that created ownership in the process and increased the chances of sustainability of project outcomes.

3.2 Project Implementation

Adaptive management

Since the project developed as planned to a great degree, there was no strong need to advance with adaptive management strategies. That is, there was no strong need to alter the project, nor implement changes in project design and outputs, nor to manage major eventual alterations since these did not occur.

That being said, there were two issues that called for adaptation and were successfully taken care of:

- (1) Government changes (political and structural); and,
- (2) Lack of funding to complete all of the anticipated activities and products.

First of all, a major restructuring within the main project partner took place (i.e. from the line Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism –MNET— to the core Ministry of Environment and Green Development –MEGD--) accompanied by political changes in the country during the project's life span. Although these fluctuations took place, they did not affect the project negatively and the project structure adapted to this change.

From the partnerships perspective, the project not only had to contend with institutional changes in Government, it also faced high rotation of managerial and political counterparts due to individuals leaving their positions within the Ministry. Furthermore, the project also had to deal with changes in the Parliament Standing Committee that attends to environmental issues.

The second issue that awaited a kind of adaptation and adaptive management was the matter of funding. Not all of the planned activities, especially for capacity building of civil society representatives (environmental NGOs and journalists), took place as envisaged given that not all funding for this was leveraged. Nevertheless, further funding has been leveraged, and these activities are to be carried out in the near future within a new project.

Partnership arrangements

Partnership arrangements were established with relevant stakeholders involved in Mongolia within the project, either directly through project management or indirectly through the involvement of different stakeholders within activities. Partnerships were implemented not only with governmental sectors, but also with civil society, such as with environmental NGOs, with journalists' organizations, and with academia and universities.

Feedback from monitoring and evaluation activities used for adaptive management

As indicated previously, within Phase II of the Strengthening Environmental Governance project there was no strong need for adaptive management since the project followed, to a large degree, its planned course regarding objectives, outcomes, and products. However, it must be highlighted that a positive feedback from monitoring and evaluation activities occurred for the transition from Phase I to Phase II.

Specifically, it should be underscored that it has been a good practice that Phase II (being evaluated here) built heavily on the monitoring and final analysis of the Project's first stage. That is, activities and outcomes implemented in Phase II were largely based on recommendations, identification of gaps and assessments arising out of the first phase. Feedback, therefore, was achieved in that sense.

Project Finance and Information on Disbursement during the Implementation Period

The actual project financing, including information on disbursement during the implementation period follows.

Project activities	2011	2012	2013	Total disbursed	Total planned as per available funds	Total planned as per ProDoc	Percentage disbursed over planned
Project component 0 Unrealized gain/loss	3,717.22	(684.05)	4,540.72	7,573.89	-		
Project component 1	107,572.83	25,100.42	26,563.71	159,236.96	159,236.96	347,870.00	100%
Project component 2	176,533.95	142,502.15	60,525.76	379,561.86	379,561.86	700,552.43	100%
Project component 3	9,324.40	11,740.32	15,285.12	36,349.84	35,150.00	110,500.00	103%
Green Economy subproject		1,173.53	87,596.29	88,769.82	90,000.00	90,000.00	99%
Project management	102,466.36	67,730.13	49,141.77	219,338.26	218,971.61	276,610.00	100%
Total (actual)	399,614.76	246,388.97	239,361.78	885,365.5			100%
Total actual expenditure (cumulative)	399,614.76	646,003.73	885,365.5				
Total disbursed over planned	423,081.43	272,760.49	239,361.78			1435532.43	
	94.45%	90.76%	97.71%				

Use of funds 2011-2013

	Funding	2011	2012	2013		
TRAC	412445.08	79,849.81	232,015.76	100,579.51		
AusAID	380,000.00	308,080.47	13,137.56	58,781.97		
Gov of MNG	12,920.43	11,684.48	1,235.65	0,30		
UK	80,000.00			80,000.00		
Total	885,365.5	399,614.76	246,388.97	239,361.78		

Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

In agreement with standard programming policies and procedures outlined by UNDP, monitoring and evaluation was designed at entry as follows:

Annually:

- Quality assessment to record progress towards the completion of key results on a quarterly basis.
- Issue Log to be activated in Atlas and updated by the Project Manager to facilitate tracking and resolution of potential problems or requests for change.
- Risk log activated in Atlas and regularly updated, based on risk analysis carried out in project design⁹.
- Project Progress Reports to be submitted by the project management to project board.
- Project lesson-learned log to be activated and regularly updated to ensure on-going learning and adaptation.
- Monitoring schedule plan to be activated in Atlas and updated to track key management actions/events.
- Annual Review Report to be prepared by the project management.

⁹See section Assumptions and Risks of this report for an analysis of the risk log.

Besides the annual review reports and monitoring (at design and implemented), a final review report has been identified that monitors overarching progress in project implementation. Furthermore, this final evaluation is part of the monitoring and evaluation implemented in agreement with UNDP procedures. Overall monitoring was adequate and sufficient. Given the above findings, M&E design at entry and its implementation was satisfactory, as was the overall quality of monitoring and evaluation.

3.3 Project Results

Overall results

In a final evaluation overall results can be considered from several approaches. First, as attainment of objectives in the sense of products and activities implemented and, second, in the sense of results, achievements and effects. The latter constructs upon the former. That is, results, achievements and outcomes, when they occur, are the consequence of products and processes. The following section summarizes overall results from both perspectives. That is a first sector deals with the main products, the following paragraphs highlight main outcomes.

First of all, within Phase II of the Strengthening Environmental Governance several activities were assumed in order to mainstream environmental issues and fortify governance, among them the following can be highlighted¹⁰:

- Road map to revise management of environmental laws, including analysis of rationale, as well as identification of main gaps and shortcomings in environmental legislation of Mongolia, undertaken by the ministry to streamline the environmental legislation.

¹⁰ These matters are reviewed also in the following paragraphs in this section per each relevant being assessed.

- Technical assistance for the support the drafting laws and by-laws (regulations and guidelines) for strengthening environmental legal framework and several laws, namely the Law on Environmental Protection, Law on Forests, Law on Water, Law on Air, Law on Wastes; regulations on environmental auditing and, guidelines on strategic and cumulative assessment; guidelines on waste; guidelines for development of criteria for assessment of land degradation and desertification processes; and package of standards on waste water.
- Activities for the institutionalization of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Auditing (EA), including the development of training manuals in environmental auditing and on strategic environmental assessment; environmental auditing training, and strategic environmental assessment.
- Drafting the structure, mandate and job descriptions for departments and divisions of the Ministry of Environment and Green Development.
- Preliminary study of risk assessment of climate change on environment and socio - economy in Mongolia.
- Training workshops in climate change mainstreaming at national and provincial levels.
- Design and implementation of studies on the cost benefit methodology for mining of Mongolia, together with development of the training manual for the implementation of CBA studies.
- Capacity building activities of civil society representatives (environmental NGOs and journalists) through training workshops (including aspects of resource mobilization, capacity building in environment for journalists, technical capacity building for environmental NGOs), including the development of materials, handbooks, etc., on environmental journalism.
- Consultation workshops with different stakeholders and national / local actors regarding different aspects of environmental governance in Mongolia.
- Development of Green Development strategy and action plan.

A ‘result’, for the purpose of an UNDP outcome level evaluation, is defined as a describable development change resulting from a cause-and-effect relationship. In UNDP terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impacts such as replication effects, and other local effects. Assessing overall project results involves attention to the full scope of a results based management (RBM) chain, from inputs to activities,

to outputs, outcomes and impacts. Nevertheless, for UNDP projects, the main focus of attention is at the outcome level, recognizing that gauging outputs is straightforward but not sufficient to capture project effectiveness.¹¹ Within the UNDP framework, results based management is a sequenced process where inputs are the financial, human and material resources used for the project and the activities are actions taken through which the project inputs are mobilized to produce specific outputs. In turn, outputs are products and services that result from the project and outcomes are the likely or achieved short- and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs.

Therefore, a series of outcomes arise, *evidently as results of the specific activities and products indicated above and of the implementation process*. For the Project being analyzed here, stronger institutional capacities and higher public awareness in the environmental governance issue, as well as transformed policy frameworks are the identified outcomes. These are characteristic examples of UNDP Projects' outcomes.

Given that the unit of analysis for this evaluation is the Project, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document and in associated modifications made during implementation, the valorization of the *overall* results is carried out as a unit.¹² The Project, as a unit, has contributed to strengthened capacity at governmental and non – governmental levels to deal with environmental governance issues in Mongolia; streamlining, updating and modernizing environmental norms that drive governance; and mainstreaming pioneering issues of environment and development in the country.

¹¹ These and other relevant guidelines and definitions for outcome level evaluations can be found in UNDP's HANDBOOK ON PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS as well as in PROJECT-LEVEL EVALUATION GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS.

¹² As indicated in Terms of Reference which are included in the Annexes.

Furthermore, specifically regarding civil society groups and expected outcomes, which were made explicit at the design and planning stage, these were generally achieved. For instance, it was indicated that the project would assist environmental organizations in defining strategies to mobilize funding, in order to become less dependent from government and from other organizations. Also, it was planned that organizational management capacity would be fostered. This has taken place, with organizations showing greater professionalization, organizational capacity, as well as thematic capacity in environmental governance issues. Nevertheless, in this regard, activities towards capacity building of NGOs were rather more limited than planned due to shortage of funds. Additionally, educational workshops of Mongolian Press institute on environmental issues was planned to be strengthened and this did take place.

Civil society groups and academics were not only involved in training and capacity building. They were also integrated into normative debates as well as consultations on norms and strategies. It can be safely stated that the sort of stakeholder involvement planned did fully take place within the project. There has been a strong involvement of civil society groups, including environmental NGOs and others, as well as involvement from the academic sector.

Largely, and based on the above findings therefore, the project results overall can be rated as *satisfactory* given that expected objectives were met and it had only minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, as per standards for ratings.¹³ This is an overall results

¹³ Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency; 5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings; 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings; 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings; 2: Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency; 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings.

assessment and rating. In the following sections of this report analysis and ratings where relevant per each pertinent criteria (relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, country ownership, mainstreaming, sustainability, effect, and adaptive management) is disaggregated for a results analysis.

Relevance

The relevance of a project is the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies. In this case, it can be stated that the project was decidedly relevant for Mongolia.

Mongolia, as stated in many of the project – related documents, had developed a series of environmental laws over the last two decades, with over 30 environmental laws approved in 20 years as well as several hundred environmental regulations and bylaws and key policy documents. Nevertheless, the implementation and enforcement of these norms has been hindered by a lack of a clear structure to the legislation, internal inconsistency and contradictory norms, as well as duplication of efforts, unclear responsibilities and a lack of capacity within government institutions. Furthermore, there was a strong need in the country for systematic capacity for sustainable management of natural resources, while enabling a sturdier enforcement of norms and a wider participation of different stakeholders in environmental governance.

Given the above, the Strengthening Environmental Governance Project, that aimed at generating coherence in environmental norms in order to engender environmental governance and that had as one of its main objectives to generate capacity and foster civil society involvement in governability, was decidedly relevant. This is bearing on the fact also that the

Project was consistent with the country's and beneficiaries needs and priorities. Therefore, based on the above findings, the relevance rating for this criterion is *Relevant (R)*.¹⁴

Effectiveness and Efficiency

Effectiveness, within the context of UNDP projects, is the extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. It is also a term used as an aggregate judgment about the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact.

The Strengthening Environmental Governance Project has been a very effective intervention given that most of the intended outcomes of the intervention have been achieved. The only outcome which has not been fully realized (Outcome 3), is expected to be achieved shortly given that new funding has been leveraged to carry out activities related to this expected output. A related criterion in evaluating UNDP projects is efficiency.

Efficiency is understood as a measure of how economically resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. The objectives were achieved efficiently and it is deemed that these have a good probability of sustainability and a positive impact at the institutional and political level given, in part, through this efficient use of resources.

In assessing how partnership strategies has influenced the efficiency of UNDP initiatives through cost-sharing measures and complementary activities, it is indicative that the cost –

¹⁴ Per Relevance ratings: 2. Relevant (R), 1. Not relevant (NR), as indicated in *Project-Level Evaluation: Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP -Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, UNDP Evaluation Office, November 2012.

sharing measures have been implemented, conducting to efficient use of resources. Furthermore, given that there is a divergence between planned and actual expenditures (the latter being less than the former) it can be stated that there has been an efficient use of funds within the limits faced given that objectives were generally met with less funds than what was projected in planning documents.

For the Strengthening Environmental Governance project in Mongolia it can be assumed that the efficiency criteria has been met given that it has converted resources of medium – sized project efficiently into outcomes, and that the objectives of the development intervention were achieved as planned in the design process. The delivery rate was met as planned (as indicated in graph included in the *Project Finance and Information on Disbursement during the Implementation Period* section). Therefore, based on the findings above regarding effectiveness and efficiency, the project can be rated satisfactory (S).¹⁵

Country ownership

Country ownership is directly related to the relevance of a project to national development and environmental agendas as well as recipient country commitment. In the case of the Strengthening Environmental Governance Project, it can be stated that there is very strong national ownership identified. Certainly at the government level, but this occurs also at the non – governmental and civil society level.

The factors that allow for this valorization include:

¹⁵ Per rating scale: Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Monitoring and Evaluation, I&E Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings; Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings; Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings as indicated in *Project-Level Evaluation: Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations Of UNDP -Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, UNDP Evaluation Office, November 2012.

- The project conception has its origins within national environmental governance agenda and within development plans of Mongolia, and it was not perceived as an exogenously imposed project.
- Outcomes have been assimilated into the national environmental governance sector of Mongolia (for instance, through the implementation of a road map to streamline environmental governance instruments, reforms in environmental laws and other such outcomes).
- Relevant country representatives from governmental and non – governmental sectors have been actively involved in all stages of the project, either in project identification and planning and/or implementation per se.
- Government of Mongolia maintained financial commitment throughout project.
- Government of Mongolia has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives.

Many of these aspects, particularly those that involve government are highly relevant in light of the changes that the environmental sector of government experienced throughout project implementation. Although the life span of the project was quite short, of just about two years, it bore important changes. Not only there was a change in government at the project's mid-point, it also experienced a radical change in the partner government ministry. Given the continuity experienced, notwithstanding these changes, the country ownership of this project is highly evident.

Mainstreaming

The project is accurately mainstreamed, first since it conforms to UNDP country programme strategies. Mainstreaming analysis assesses whether UNDP projects are in harmony with key elements in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should align with UNDP country programme strategies, assessing how projects successfully mainstream within UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment. This is done, among other manners, by reviewing whether country's UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) concur with project objectives.

In this case, this occurs, for instance, since the project fits with UNDAF Outcome “*Systematic capacity for sustainable management of resources enhanced at the central and local levels, while facilitating a stronger enforcement of legislation and a wider participation of primary resource users.*”¹⁶ It also follows findings identified in the Common Country Assessment (CCA), which form the base for UNDAF. The CCA findings relevant to this project relate to economic growth, which is generated currently through the mining sector, and it indicates that mineral prices are deemed unsustainable as well as the need to create more job opportunities in order to anchor growth. The CCA identifies several significant features of human development in Mongolia, many of them related directly and indirectly with environmental governance issues. For instance matters of rising unplanned urbanization or the need to create more job opportunities through a carefully planned process of industrialization that combines improved local business capacity with international expertise and technology are identified.¹⁷

¹⁶As specified in the Project Document.

¹⁷UNDAF 2007 -2011 cycle, Common Country Assessment 2005.

These are of course some of the pillars of green economy which the project addressed and which the country is engaged in, green economy being defined as improved human well-being and social equity, while considerably reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities. Second, acknowledging the efforts at strengthening institutions of democratic governance, the very root of the environmental governance project, there is an expressed need to ensure greater transparency, accountability, and better mainstreaming of democratic principles across all levels of society. In this matter, the role of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and the media are recognized as key players in development. Furthermore, since the project includes key aspects of sustainable development it, in effect, mainstreams other UNDP priorities (key priorities such as increased governance or sustainable development).

Mainstreaming, therefore, is assessed positively given that improved natural resource management arrangements have been promoted throughout the project and intimately weaved in the improvement of policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, as well as for the regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability. All of the above conforming country programme strategies.

Sustainability

When valuing sustainability a terminal evaluation predicts the extent to which benefits of initiatives are likely to continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure development results in the future. That is, an evaluation estimates if the conditions are in place so that project-related benefits and results are to be sustained in the medium and long term.

It can be stated that, given outcomes, effects, relevance, and country ownership, sustainability of effects is decidedly likely to continue in time and that major risks to sustainability are unlikely. The project certainly had sustainability intertwined in its implementation strategy. This is the case given that the project worked on institutional frameworks and policies for governance, with different stakeholders. That is, the project worked directly with institutional frameworks, policies and processes. This, in turn, underlines the possibility of sustainability given the level of national ownership and measures involved.¹⁸

The high stakeholder ownership, from governmental and non – governmental stakeholders, is also an indicator that the outcomes of the Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia project is likely to be sustainable, and that political risks (always present nevertheless) are minimized. A high level of stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives has also been identified, which strengthens the possibilities of sustainability.

Exploring the different components involved in prospective sustainability, the overall sustainability rating is deemed at moderately likely taking into account different aspects such as financial resources to be made available for sustaining outputs and outcomes, socio – political situation, institutional framework and governance, as well as environmental factors of sustainability. Regarding financial resources it is deemed that the likelihood of sustainability is moderately likely, given that funds are allocated and are likely to be allocated for maintaining governance structures and promote the implementation of governance outputs and outcomes generated throughout the project phases. While the socio political situation is indicative of moderately likely sustainability factors, given the foreseen political stability factors, with only

¹⁸As indicated in UNDP evaluation guidelines, by assessing development effectiveness, monitoring and evaluation efforts aim to assess the following: . . . “. Level of national ownership and measures to enhance national capacity for sustainability of results”, UNDP HANDBOOK ON PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS, 2009.

minor issues rising in the environment field within the current socio political context. The possibility of sustainability is likely when considering institutional framework and governance. That is, when considering the very root of the project's outputs and outcomes in both phases of implementation. Lastly, regarding the environmental component per se, the likelihood of sustainability is considered likely. Again, given all of the above components, the overall likelihood of sustainability is weighed at likely regarding the ability of the intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.¹⁹

Effect

Besides the specific activities and products indicated in the above section regarding products and outputs, there have been, in turn, effects and outcomes generated which, in short, are the crucial aspects that a results – based final evaluations analyzes. The outcome – level results can be summarized in three broad sections or areas as follows:

- *Strengthened capacity at governmental and non – governmental levels.* Certainly this is one of the most solid effects and outcomes of the Strengthening Environmental Governance Project in Mongolia overall, not only effective at the government level but also effective at the civil society level (that is, with NGOs, journalist organizations, formal academic institutions).

¹⁹Per Sustainability ratings: Likely (L) negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future; Moderately Likely (ML) moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained, Moderately Unlikely (MU) substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on; Unlikely (UL) severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained; as indicated in *Project-Level Evaluation: Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations Of UNDP - Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, UNDP Evaluation Office, November 2012.

- *Streamlining, updating and modernizing environmental norms to drive governance.* The support of drafting laws and by-laws and the streamlining of Mongolia's environmental legislation has had as an effect the generation of a more strategic set of norms that impels improved governance, with many of the drafted norms subsequently approved by Parliament.
- *Mainstreaming modern visions and new issues as they pertain to environmental governance in an integrated manner.* Innovative issues have commenced to be mainstreamed into environmental governance issues, such as green development for instance. The project has aided in beginning to identify and beginning to operationalize mainstreamed and new environmental issues (such as green development, environmental governance and civil society, for instance) in the national debate in Mongolia. Other issues that can be considered new for Mongolia, such as climate change adaptation, have also been weaved in the project. Together with this, the project helps define the roles and responsibilities of the former line ministry to become the Ministry of Environment and Green Development, one of the core cabinet ministries.

Adaptive management for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

The project, as indicated earlier, has had adequate adaptive management for the design, implementation, as well as evaluation and monitoring. Also, as indicated before in this document, there was no need for major operations in adaptive management since the project followed and completed guidelines as set forth at the design stage to a large degree.

4. Conclusion and Ratings, Recommendations, Best Practices and Lessons Learned

Conclusion and Ratings

Overall the findings and conclusions of this project (Phase II but also including some aspects of Phase I where pertinent) is that it has been a successful project implementing expected outputs to a great degree and generating outcomes. As summarized in the ratings below, the Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project has been a positive intervention, with only minor problems or issues surfacing throughout its implementation.

Ratings chart

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

The rating scales used for different criteria are as follows:

Rating Scales for Different Criteria

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

Recommendations for future directions underlining main objectives and actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

Notwithstanding the very positive valorization of the project, a robust set of proposals for future directions underlining main objectives and future work have been drawn. Several of them are based on what the project could not accomplish.

Following UNDP guidelines, final project evaluations (such as this) should include recommendations for future approaches to addressing the main challenges of a project and for follow up actions. These recommendations are directed to the intended users of the evaluation regarding what actions to take and decisions to make. In order to explicitly establish the link between the proposed themes and the evaluation findings, it is indicated that these arise out of document analysis and stakeholder analysis on future directions as well as through capturing valid tacit and explicit recommendations within project documents. This is the concrete link between the evaluation findings (as above) and the recommendations. The recommendations are

specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

The recommendations are grouped into two broad areas: process and thematic. The process proposals are outlined given that they have been identified throughout this evaluation as the most strategic needs to be met for further strengthening environmental governance at all procedural levels in Mongolia. Thematic recommendations, given that the subjects indicated are the keen issues related to environment and development that Mongolia faces today (mining, climate change, urban air pollution) as well as the thematic policy challenges to be faced in the near future (i.e. the implementation of green development concepts). They are forward looking proposals building upon the Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project's experience.

Process proposals for future direction:

- *Continue work in capacity building and capacity strengthening in environmental governance at all levels in Mongolia.* Although most certainly the project in both of its phases has made great strides in capacity building and capacity strengthening in environmental governance in the country (both at the governmental and non – governmental levels), it is considered that there is still ample room to work in this matter in the country. Further projects or continuations of some aspects of this project (of both Phase I and Phase II) is sought and recommended by stakeholders, perhaps emphasizing certain aspects over others. But it is generally thought that there is a need to deepen capacity. Also, it has been pointed out that capacity building and strengthening still is needed regarding all aspects associated to the battery of norms currently in place in Mongolia, especially regarding guidelines, regulations and by – laws.
- *Effective implementation of environmental governance norms and policies.* Gaps continue to be identified between the capacity built throughout the project in Phase I and Phase II and actual effective implementation of environmental governance norms and policies. Therefore, future directions of projects and activities successfully dealing with this matter are recommended, enhancing the effective implementation of policies. Some specific areas have been mentioned as needing strengthening for the effective implementation of environmental policies field, such as, *inter alia*: access to justice; restoration of infringed rights; access to actual remedial actions in environmental and development issues; and operative access to information.

- *Mainstream environmental governance issues in and within other areas of government besides environment core ministry.* In order to mainstream environment and development issues in policies and governance, it would be helpful if future interventions could work in mainstreaming environmental governance and environmental issues in other policy areas (ministries dealing with mining, with industry, with agriculture, with health, for example).²⁰
- *Generate capacity and mainstream environmental governance issues besides the national level.* In order to mainstream environment and development issues in policies and governance, it would be helpful if future interventions could work intensively in mainstreaming environmental governance issues and generating capacity at other levels of governance besides the national level. The need for working at the provincial / aimag level, at the city level, and in the countryside has been stressed by different governmental and non – governmental actors.
- *Increase capacity, training, research and formal education in environmental law.* In order to be able to effectively implement environmental policies and norms, there is a strong need to further formal education in environmental law at the university and graduate levels. Improvement of the law education system would also be helpful in order to generate a corps of national professionals in environmental legislation and governance.
- *Expand work already carried out to rural settings and organizations.* Albeit the outcomes of both phases of the project are rather positive, it has been

²⁰ Although the project aimed at this matter as well as working at the sub – national level, it was not fully successful as with other areas of work and outcomes. Although it can be argued that the upgrading of an environmental line ministry to a core ministry does in some way take care of this issue, it would still be helpful for effective environmental governance to work in different policy areas.

repeatedly suggested that they should be expanded to rural settings and to NGOS / CBOs / CSOs and journalists outside of the capital.

- *Capacity building in environmental auditing and strategic environmental assessment for experts.* Further work in order to build and strengthen capacity for experts and officials is deemed as needed.
- *Capacity building for NGOs / CSOs / CBOs professionalization/strengthening.* Further work in order to build capacity for civil society organizations is deemed as needed. Not only in environmental auditing, assessment, and other matters but also to build capacity for advocacy and public participation in decision – making.
- *Develop materials, data bases, research, and products.* A need for training materials, data bases, and research in issues related to environmental governance as well as more specific or technical issues is manifest. This can certainly add in reinforcing initial benefits of the project. Furthermore, it has been also pointed out that important and innovative environmental and climate change studies have been carried out within the framework of the project (such as developing the model for the cost benefit analysis of mining and preliminary climate change risk assessment). In order for these studies to be more effective, more visible, as well as more applicable, they should be streamlined and put in formats that are useful for different stakeholders (policy makers or civil society organizations).

Thematic proposals for future direction:

- *Mining issues and environmental governance.* It is undeniable that mining is the main driver of the Mongolian economy and of the country's development process. It is also clear that the country does not hold at the moment the necessary tools and processes, or in some cases even the technology, to deal with mining within a context of green development as the nation aims to be embarked upon. Therefore, a key thematic proposal for future direction is to work at different angles and issues related to environmental governance within the subject of this productive activity. For instance, improving tools and methodologies as well as implementing instruments to systematically evaluate and address the costs of environmental damage from the mining sector (including working on baseline data generation and gathering) such as has begun to be done within the Project. Furthermore, to validate and enact public participation in the permitting processes as well as in the overseeing process of mining operations. Additionally, facing the need to update policies

that deal with mining development to include environmental and development aspects, not only in the permitting and operational phases but also in the restoration periods. Furthermore, the strengthening of sub – national government at all levels should accompany the development of instruments and institutionalism dealing with mining and environmental issues. Aid in technology transfer and implementation of best practices that diminish and / or mitigate environmental damage and negative social impacts of mining is also a recommendation for future work in this issue. In short, future work could aid the country to develop, implement, and regulate the application of norms, guidelines and instruments that mainstream environmental and development issues within the mining sector and its relevant institutional framework in coordination with environmental governance authorities at all levels.

- *Climate change.* Thematically this is one the new issues that environmental governance is beginning to deal with in Mongolia, and therefore a strong entry issue for future work underlining and reinforcing the initial benefits of the Strengthening Environmental Governance project. It has been indicated that not only issues of climate change adaptation need to be worked on further, but also low carbon development. Within this thematic proposal it is also recommended that there should be strengthening of the legal and institutional framework of climate change issues (including, among others, resiliency, adaptation, mitigation and low – carbon development issues).
- *Urban development, including urban pollution.* Being Ulaanbaatar one of the cities with greatest levels of air pollution in the world, a thematic area that could most certainly be further developed is dealing with this issue in an integrated manner. Stakeholders have linked this thematic area with others for future work, such as low carbon economy and urban development. Inter-agency cooperation (with each agency bringing their valued added and comparative advantages), working with other donors, as well as working with environmentally sustainable and healthy cities initiatives could harness future work in this field.
- *Green development.* Mongolia has begun to take first steps to mainstream green development as a national strategy. It has been called forth that UNDP should aid the country in giving substance to this concept. Particularly, in light of new political debates on what this concept means for the nation and also, to coherently and cohesively work with the donor community in defining and operationalizing this concept for Mongolia. The probable future directions in this issue which have been called for indicates that this thematic

area is also open for work on more technical aspects (besides the already mentioned political aspects above). These thematic matters and technical aspects include environmental economy issues, cost benefit analysis, and other such issues that can build upon the experience gathered in the Strengthening Environmental Governance project.

Best practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Best practices

Evaluation reports include, if available, best and worst practices that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that would be applicable to other UNDP interventions.

The best practices identified in the context of this project have been:

- Inclusiveness of a wide array of different types of stakeholders (government, non – governmental, academic, journalists) in the project.
- Close fit between country needs and project activities, and also a deep knowledge of environmental governance needs, gaps and overall situation.
- Clear government commitment accompanied by UNDP, not only in the beginning inception / design stage but also throughout political and administrative changes that deeply transformed environment ministry within the project's short life – span.
- Project adapted to government and administrative changes at the ministry, assuring continuity and sustainability of project's outcomes.

Lessons learned

Lessons learned are generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact. In the context of this project, the following can be identified as lessons learned:

- The inclusion of various types of stakeholders has been positive for the development of this project. The involvement of stakeholders from academia, non – governmental organizations, and the media (besides government

stakeholders) has been positive not only to make the project inclusive but also to generate greater impact, effects and promote mainstreaming of environmental governance issues and the sustainability of effects in the medium to long term. A lesson learned, therefore, is that involvement of stakeholders is positive for the implementation process as well as for the generation of outcomes sustainable over time.

- All sectors of government and of the State (other line and core ministries besides environment sectorial ministry, aimags, city governments, parliaments) should be involved from the very early stages of the project (from the design stage if possible) in order to mainstream environmental governance issues at all levels and in all areas of governments. A lesson learned therefore is that projects are more effective and generate more sustainable outcomes if they would include all levels and sectors of environmental governance institutions.
- Regarding civil society groups, it would also have been more helpful if civil society groups and non – governmental organizations as well as media from rural areas and aimags would have been included in the project as beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- A lesson learned is that capacity building is a process and projects should include not only adequate technical components but also adequate timing to incorporate in depth capacity, especially when dealing with decision – making and governance processes. Furthermore, the lesson learned is that capacity building has been a very positive process and outcome in this project, however, further training and in – depth training is needed for some issues (not only of government officials but also of civil society, including academia).
- A lesson learned is that studies and materials developed throughout the study are helpful, yet they are more susceptible to implementation and suitable if they are accompanied by a knowledge management process that makes them accessible and functional for most actors.

5. Annexes

Project Logical Framework Extracted From Project Document

Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resource Framework:				
Outcome 3: A holistic approach to environmentally sustainable development is promoted and practiced for improving the well-being of rural and urban poor				
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:				
5.1.1 Indicator: number of domestic laws, regulations adopted or revised, to support United Nations conventions, e.g., Kyoto protocol				
5.1.2 Indicator/target: implementation of MOUs/agreements between authorities on their responsibilities over natural resource management				
5.2.1 Indicator: number of CBOs contributing to effective resource management; pastoral area under rotational grazing scheme, area of community reserved pastures, and irrigated pastures				
Applicable Key Result Area (from 2008-11 Strategic Plan): Environment and sustainable development				
Partnership Strategy: The project will strongly rely on the involvement of partners MNET, Local Government, NGOs and the Press Institute to implement activities				
Project title and ID (61190): Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia – Phase II				
INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
Output 1: Road map developed to harmonise and strengthen Mongolia's environmental legislative framework Baseline: Gap analysis carried out on Mongolia's environmental laws, without formal strategy in place to revise environmental law management system. Indicators: Completion of Road Map to harmonise Mongolia's environmental legislative framework.	Development of the Road Map Targets (year 1) - Develop roadmap to revise environmental law management system through consultative process Targets (year 2) - At least 2 laws amended/initiated in line with road map Targets (year 3) - Monitoring system of the roadmap in place - At least 2 laws amended/initiated in line with road map	1.1 Development of road map to revise management of environmental laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organise consultative meetings Drafting of Road Map Establish monitoring systems 1.2 Support the implementation of the road map <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to drafting of new environmental laws and amendments including the law on environmental impact assessment Support to drafting a national road map on transition towards resource efficiency and green economy Support the strengthening of a legislative framework for climate change GEF project document on the Integrated Management of the Amur/Heilong River Basin prepared Support to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism Ministry of Justice Line Ministries Parliament Standing Committee on Environment and Agriculture Environmental Civil Council of Mongolia UNDP UNEP 	

		including the HCFC phase-out plan		
<p>Output 2 Environmental Mainstreaming Mechanisms developed for adoption by government</p> <p>Baseline: Draft concepts for Institutional framework for SEA and EA developed</p> <p>Indicators: Complete documents for institutional framework for SEA and EA</p>	<p>Targets (year 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advocacy and training on revised SEA and EA policies - Development of SEA and EA legislation - Development of methodology to carry out cost-benefit analysis for mining sites in Mongolia - Development of manual to carry out cost-benefit analysis for mining sites in Mongolia - Carry out gap analysis for roles and responsibilities for environmental management in one pilot aimag. <p>Targets (year 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carry out Pilot Cost-Benefit Analysis of 2 Mining sites - Implement Pilot SEA in Gobi Region <p>Targets (year 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of detailed SEA and EA regulations - Develop model agreement on revised roles and responsibilities of environmental management in one pilot aimag 	<p>2.1 Institutionalisation of SEA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support to the SEA working group to draft SEA legislation ▪ Support to the SEA working group to draft SEA regulations ▪ Carry out pilot SEA in Gobi site ▪ Advocacy/Training <p>2.2 Institutionalisation of EA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support to the EA working group to drafting EA legislation ▪ Support to the EA working group to drafting EA regulations ▪ Advocacy/Training <p>2.3 Strengthening Environment and Climate Change Coordination Mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support CC office to carry out CC mainstreaming activities ▪ Establish an agreement on the roles and responsibilities for environmental management in 1 pilot aimag ▪ Establish CC library in all 21 Aimag Government offices <p>2.4 Developing a methodology to carry out cost benefit analysis for Mining in Mongolia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop methodology for conducting cost-benefit analysis for mining in Mongolia ▪ Develop handbook on methodology to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism ▪ Line Ministries ▪ Parliament Standing Committee on Environment and Agriculture ▪ Environmental Civil Council of Mongolia ▪ EIA/SEA/EA Companies ▪ National Audit Board ▪ Mining companies ▪ UNDP ▪ AYAD ▪ UNEP 	

		<p>carry out cost-benefit analysis of mining sites in Mongolia and advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carry out pilot Cost benefit analysis for 1 mining site. ▪ Advocacy and trainings 		
<p>Output 3: Resource Mobilisation strategy for Environmental NGOs/CSOs is developed</p> <p>Baseline: Environmental NGOs/CSOs lack strategy to generate sufficient resources to carry out their planned activities.</p> <p>Indicators: # of environmental NGOs with Resource Mobilisation plan in place</p>	<p>Resource Mobilisation</p> <p>Targets (year 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resource Mobilisation Strategy for Mongolia's Environmental NGOs developed - Environmental Educational System for journalists developed <p>Targets (year 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 20 Environmental NGOs have resource mobilisation plan in place <p>Targets (year 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Fund raising campaign for environmental NGOs Organised -Resource Mobilisation Plan for Environmental NGOs is developed 	<p>3.1 Resource Mobilisation plan for Environmental NGOs/CSOs developed</p> <p>3.1.1 Organise national consultation on resource mobilisation opportunities for Mongolia's environmental NGOs.</p> <p>3.1.2 Organise training on resource mobilisation and management for Environmental NGOs</p> <p>3.1.3 Develop manual and online training course on resource mobilisation for environmental NGOs.</p> <p>3.1.4 Develop guidebook for NGOs/CSOs on the promotion of volunteerism in environmental protection.</p> <p>3.2 Educational capacity of the press institute on environmental issues is strengthened</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of an Environmental Component for the BSc Curriculum of the Press Institute ▪ Development of online database for environmental information for the journalist environment club. ▪ Organise trainings on environmental issues for rural journalists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental Civil Council of Mongolia ▪ Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism ▪ Press Institute ▪ UNDP ▪ AYAD ▪ UNV ▪ UNEP 	

List of deliverables that will be achieved with the UNDP funds already committed:

- Road map
- Action plan
- Amendment of two laws in line with action plan
- Advocacy and training on revised SEA and EA policies
- SEA and EA legislation
- EIA environmental law
- Roads map towards a green economy
- GEF full sized project document
- Gap analysis for roles and responsibilities for environmental management in one pilot aimag
- Manual for mining cost-benefit analysis
- Resource Mobilisation Strategy for Mongolia's Environmental NGOs
- Environmental Educational System for journalists
- Resource mobilisation plans in place for 10 environmental NGOs.

List of deliverables for AusAID funding

- Methodology for mining cost-benefit analysis
- Handbook for mining cost-benefit analysis
- Cost Benefit Analysis Study for 1 pilot site

Rating Scales for Different Criteria

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

As indicated in as indicated in *Project-Level Evaluation: Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations Of UNDP - Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, UNDP Evaluation Office, November 2012.

ToR National Consultant



CONSULTANCY FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION OF "STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE in MONGOLIA" PHASE II project

Location :	Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
Application Deadline :	June 10, 2013
Additional Category	Environment and Energy
Type of Contract :	Individual Contract
Post Level :	National Consultant
Languages Required:	Mongolian, English
Starting Date :	12 June, 2013
Expected Duration of Assignment:	27 days (Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia)

BACKGROUND

Between 2007 and 2010, the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism partnered with UNDP to implement the 'Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project, with financial assistance from the Royal Government of the Netherlands and UNDP Mongolia to assist the Government of Mongolia to achieve the objective to "improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth; make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature".

Within the context of the UN Development Assistance Framework 2012-2016, UNDP and UNEP prepared a joint project to support strengthening environmental governance in Mongolia that aimed to more effectively coordinate the provision of UN support to the environment and strengthen Delivering as One UN. The 'Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia' project phase II was designed to address some of the concerns faced by Mongolia and was funded by UNDP, and the

Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) with financial contribution of the Government of Mongolia and began in 2011 and will be terminated by June 30, 2013.

The second phase of the project was built on the results and recommendations of the first phase. The main focus of the project Phase II was on: (1) Streamlining and strengthening of Mongolia's environmental legislative framework; (2) Strengthening environmental mainstreaming mechanisms, and (3) Strengthening capacity of NGOs/CSOs to engage in environmental governance processes. Under each of these goals a number of activities and outcomes were delivered. An evaluation is required of each activity undertaken as part of the project phase II.

This Project needs to undergo evaluation upon completion of implementation to identify performance levels, achievements and lessons learned. A result oriented evaluation of the project Phase II is to ensure that all key milestones were met and the degree to which these milestones have had a lasting impact on the Mongolian Government's propensity to maintain and build strong environmental governance frameworks in the future.

OBJECTIVE

The objectives of the terminal evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

SPECIFIC TASKS

The national consultant will assist the international consultant will prepare an evaluation work plan that will operationalize and direct the evaluation. The work plan will describe how the evaluation is to be carried out, bringing refinements, specificity and elaboration to these terms of reference. It will be approved by UNDP Country office, namely the Environment Team Leader and act as the agreement between parties for how the evaluation is to be conducted.

The evaluation is to include a site visit to Ulaanbaatar to consult with MEGD, UNDP and project stakeholders and to collect information in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the evaluation workplan. This mission is expected to be no longer than ten days in duration.

The evaluation will focus primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness. This will include

- Assessment of the project in its entirety and its appropriateness and effectiveness in the context of promoting stronger Governance arrangements over the 5 year period. It should also provide consideration of the long term impact of the Project and Lessons Learnt for future project design.
- Assessment of the Phase II individually in reaching the intended outcomes (reference to the annual reports)
- Assessment of the relationships fostered between aid organizations and the Ministry of Environment and Green Development
- Assessment of the activities under each Phase and their respective effectiveness and efficiency.

- A comment should be made about whether the project was effective in capacity building within the Ministry of Environment and Green Development

The review will also take a broader view of a range of other issues including the processes of partnership funding and specific Government funds. It will also consider the level of community engagement, organisational development and service specific training. The review will also consider the provision of professional advice to the project and its impact.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular UNDP Country Office, project team, and key stakeholders.

The evaluators will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia. Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum: relevant departments of the Ministry of environment, Green Development and Civil Council of environmental NGOs.

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the project Phase II, based on the project documents supplied at the outset of the procurement. An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for Delivering as One UN. The 'Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia' project phase II minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings performance levels, achievements and lessons learned. A result oriented evaluation of the project evaluation executive summary.

The unit of analysis for this evaluation is the joint project, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

Deliverables:

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the UNDP Mongolia:

- **Inception report** – clarifies timing and method of review, no later than one week before the mission
- **Presentation** – initial finding before the end of mission to Mongolia to Project management unit and UNDP country office
- **Draft Final Report** to be submitted within 10 days after the completion of the field visit to UNDP CO
- **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within one week after reception of the draft final report with comments from UNDP Mongolia and the Ministry of Environment and Green

Development) with a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons learned** within 1 week of receiving comments on draft to be sent UNDP CO

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the two phase project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation report outline can be as follows:

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP financed project
 - UNDP project 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
-
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 rated¹)
 - 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

¹ 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
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mongolia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation consultant. The Project Team will be responsible

for liaising with the Evaluators to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Key roles and responsibilities:

The evaluation team will be composed of one international (team leader) and one national consultant who will be responsible for assisting the team leader. The International Consultant and the National Consultant will be selected independently by the Evaluation Panel but will be required to work together as a team and will be jointly responsible in the achievement of the key deliverables of this assignment.

The consultants selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team will fulfill the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNDP norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the UNDP Mongolia and MEGD on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.

The international consultant will have the overall responsibility for preparing and submitting the evaluation deliverables mentioned above. The expected number of working days for the international consultant is 27 working days to be distributed as follows:

- Preparation phase: 5 days
- In country mission: 10 days (overlap with preparation of the draft report)
- Preparation of draft report: 7 days
- Finalization of the report: 5 days

Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
- Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment

Functional Competencies:

- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- Knowledge of UNDP's results based evaluation policies and procedures
- Strong writing and analytical skills coupled with experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques, results-based in particular;
- Computer literacy.

Required Skills and Experience

Education:

- Applicants must have a minimum of a Master's degree in natural resources management/economics, environmental economics, environmental management, economics, development or a closely ecology related field.

Experience:

- Recognized national and international experience in natural resources management, environmental economics, or closely ecology related field. Previous experience in Asia is an asset.
- At least 10 years of relevant professional experience including 5 years of recognized expertise in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programs, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported projects
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Previous involvement and understanding of UNDP procedures is an advantage and
- Extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is required; experience in science to policy linkages would be welcome.

Language Requirements:

Excellent English communication skills

Application process

- Applicants are requested to submit their applications at the UN country office by 10th of June 2013. Individual consultants are invited to submit Cover letter (1 page) stating your interest in and qualifications; explaining why they are the most suitable for the assignment together with CV for this position with indication of the e-mail and phone contact along with at least 2 references
- A max 2-page methodology outline (describing briefly how they will approach and conduct the evaluation)
-
- Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit financial proposal. Financial proposal should consist of a lumpsum (total) and also a breakdown of costs: (1) daily fee; (2) travel/accommodation costs for field missions in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia (10 days mission). The cost proposal of the consultant is a lump sum proposal, including all visa, travel and accommodation costs and other costs required to deliver under the terms of this contract. (For more details refer to Application process and evaluation of applicants). The evaluator will be responsible for office space, administrative support, telecommunications, printing of documentation and implementation of tools such as the survey and focus group discussions. The Project s and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel possible, by providing contact information, documentation for desk review, reviewing draft report and providing feedback to the evaluators. All costs should be listed in USD.

Evaluation

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that takes into account both the technical qualification of potential consultants as well as the financial proposals submitted in support of

Financial Evaluation - 20 points (20%)



**CONSULTANCY FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION OF
"STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE in MONGOLIA" project**

Location : Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
Application Deadline : June 3, 2013
Additional Category Environment and Energy
Type of Contract : Individual Contract
Post Level : International Consultant
Languages Required: English
Starting Date : 10 June, 2013
Expected Duration of Assignment: 27 days with 10 days mission to Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

BACKGROUND

Mongolia has made impressive steps forward in developing its economy since the transition period of the early 1990s. In 2011 Mongolia was the fastest growing economy in the world. Mining is the engine room of Mongolia's economic development. However, as is the case in many transition countries, the desire to develop quickly and raise living standards is having an observable effect on environmental quality. Numerous studies have shown that air pollution is out of control in urban areas. Land degradation is being caused by overgrazing and other development pressures. Biodiversity is declining.

Between 2007 and 2010, the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism partnered with UNDP to implement the 'Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia Project, with financial assistance from the Royal Government of the Netherlands and UNDP Mongolia to assist the Government of Mongolia to achieve the objective to "improve consistency of policies for protection, proper use and rehabilitation of natural wealth; make transparent and accessible information related to nature and the environment, and; increase public participation and monitoring in the protection of nature".

Within the context of the UN Development Assistance Framework 2012-2016, UNDP and UNEP prepared a joint project to support strengthening environmental governance in Mongolia that aimed to more effectively coordinate the provision of UN support to the environment and strengthen Delivering as One UN. The 'Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia' project phase II was designed to address some of the concerns faced by Mongolia and was funded by UNDP, and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) with financial contribution of the Government of Mongolia and began in 2011 and will be terminated by June 30, 2013. The second phase of the project was built on the results and recommendations of the first phase. The main focus of the project Phase II was on: (1) Streamlining and strengthening of Mongolia's environmental legislative framework; (2) Strengthening environmental mainstreaming mechanisms, and (3) Strengthening capacity of NGOs/CSOs to engage in environmental governance processes. Under each of these goals a number of activities and outcomes were delivered. An evaluation is required of each activity undertaken as part of the project phase II.

The Environmental governance programme needs to undergo evaluation upon completion of implementation to identify performance levels, achievements and lessons learned. A result oriented evaluation of the project Phase I and II is to ensure that all key milestones were met and the degree to which these milestones have had a lasting impact on the Mongolian Government's propensity to maintain and build strong environmental governance frameworks in the future.

OBJECTIVE

The objectives of the terminal evaluation are to assess the achievement of the project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

SPECIFIC TASKS

The international consultant will prepare an evaluation work plan that will operationalize and direct the evaluation. The work plan will describe how the evaluation is to be carried out, bringing refinements, specificity and elaboration to these terms of reference. It will be approved by UNDP Country office, namely the Environment Team Leader and act as the agreement between parties for how the evaluation is to be conducted.

The evaluation is to include a site visit to Ulaanbaatar to consult with MEGD, UNDP and project stakeholders and to collect information in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the evaluation workplan. This mission is expected to be no longer than ten days in duration.

The evaluation will focus primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness. This will include

- Assessment of the project in its entirety and its appropriateness and effectiveness in the context of promoting stronger Governance arrangements over the 5 year period. It should also provide consideration of the long term impact of the Project and Lessons Learnt for future project design.

- Assessment of the Phase I and II individually in reaching the intended outcomes (reference to the annual reports)
- Assessment of the relationships fostered between aid organizations and the Ministry of Environment and Green Development
- Assessment of the activities under each Phase and their respective effectiveness and efficiency.
- A comment should be made about whether the project was effective in capacity building within the Ministry of Environment and Green Development

The review will also take a broader view of a range of other issues including the processes of partnership funding and specific Government funds. It will also consider the level of community engagement, organisational development and service specific training. The review will also consider the provision of professional advice to the project and its impact.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular UNDP Country Office, project team, and key stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia. Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum: relevant departments of the Ministry of environment, Green Development and Civil Council of environmental NGOs.

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the project Phase I and II, based on the project documents supplied at the outset. An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, 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 following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

The unit of analysis for this evaluation is the joint project, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

Deliverables:

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the UNDP Mongolia:

- **Inception report** – clarifies timing and method of review, no later than one week before the mission
- **Presentation** – initial finding before the end of mission to Mongolia to Project management unit and UNDP country office

- **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days after the completion of the field visit) to UNDP CO CO,
- **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within one week after reception of the draft final report with comments from UNDP Mongolia and the Ministry of Environment and Green Development) with a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons learned** within 1 week of receiving comments on draft to be sent UNDP CO*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The final report will be no less than 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 2 pages that includes a brief description of the two phase project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation report outline can be as follows:

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP financed project
 - UNDP project 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
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 rated¹)
 - 3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach

¹ 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.

- 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
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mongolia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Key roles and responsibilities:

The evaluation team will be composed of one international (team leader) and one national consultant who will be responsible for assisting the team leader. The International Consultant and the National Consultant will be selected independently by the Evaluation Panel but will be required to work together as a team and will be jointly responsible in the achievement of the key deliverables of this assignment.

The consultants selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team will fulfill the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNDP norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the UNDP Mongolia and MEGD on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.

The international consultant will have the overall responsibility for preparing and submitting the evaluation deliverables mentioned above. The expected number of working days for the international consultant is 27 working days to be distributed as follows:

- Preparation phase: 5 days
- In country mission: 10 days (overlap with preparation of the draft report)
- Preparation of draft report: 7 days
- Finalization of the report: 5 days

Competencies

Corporate
Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
- Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment

Functional Competencies:

- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- Knowledge of UNDP's results based evaluation policies and procedures

- Strong writing and analytical skills coupled with experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques, results-based in particular;
- Computer literacy.

Required Skills and Experience

Educational:

- Applicants must have a minimum of a Master's degree in natural resources management/economics, environmental economics, environmental management, economics, development or a closely ecology related field.

Experience:

-

Recognized national and international experience in natural resources management, environmental economics, or closely ecology related field. Previous experience in Asia is an asset

- At least 10 years of relevant professional experience including 5 years of recognized expertise in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programs, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported projects
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Previous involvement and understanding of UNDP procedures is an advantage and
- Extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is required; experience in science to policy linkages would be welcome.

Language Requirements:

Excellent English communication skills

Application process

- Applicants are requested to apply online to <http://jobs.undp.org> by 3rd of June, 2013. Individual consultants are invited to submit Cover letter (1 page) stating your interest in and qualifications; explaining why they are the most suitable for the assignment together with CV for this position with indication of the e-mail and phone contact along with at least 2 references
- A max 2-page methodology outline (describing briefly how they will approach and conduct the evaluation)

Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit financial proposal. Financial proposal should consist of a lumpsum (total) and also a breakdown of costs: (1) daily fee; (2)

travel/accommodation costs for field missions in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia (10 days mission). The cost proposal of the consultant is a lump sum proposal, including all visa, travel and accommodation costs and other costs required to deliver under the terms of this contract. (For more details refer to Application process and evaluation of applicants). The evaluator will be responsible for office space, administrative support, telecommunications, printing of documentation and implementation of tools such as the survey and focus group discussions. The Project national coordinator will facilitate the process to the extent possible, by providing contact information, documentation for desk review, reviewing draft report and providing feedback to the evaluators. All costs should be listed in USD.

Evaluation

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that takes into account both the technical qualification of potential consultants as well as the financial proposals submitted in support of consultant applications. Candidate applications will be evaluated using a cumulative analysis method taking into consideration the combination of applicant qualifications and a financial proposal. The contract will be awarded to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- having received the highest score out of below defined technical, interview and financial criteria.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 percent of points in the technical evaluation will be considered in the second stage of the evaluation process

Criteria

Technical Evaluation (80%)

Out of which:

Environmental governance/Policies related work experience/expertise – 20 points

Evaluation related work experience/expertise – 50 points

Regional experience/expertise – 5 points

Applied research, writing, international organizations experience/expertise – 5 points

Financial Evaluation - 20 points (20%)

Itinerary and Mission Agenda

17 October	Departure, International Consultant, Buenos Aires, Argentina
20 October	Arrival, International Consultant in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
21 October	<p>9.00 Ms. Bunchingiv B, UNDP CO Environment Team Leader</p> <p>Ms. Khandarmaa Davaajamts, NPC, Strengthening environmental governance project Phase II, UNDP</p> <p>10:00 Mr. Batbold, Alternate Project National Director, MEGD Director, Division of International Cooperation</p> <p>14.00 Ms. Bulgan, Director General, Department of Green Development Policy and Planning, MEGD</p> <p>15.00 Ms. Bunchinjav, P. Officer, Department of Environmental Auditing and Environmental Assessment, MEGD</p> <p>Ms. Erdenetsetseg Environmental Auditing and Environmental Assessment, MEGD</p>
22 October	<p>10.00 Press Institute, Ms. Gunjidmaa at Press Institute</p> <p>12:00 Mr. Thomas Eriksson, DRR, UNDP</p>
23 October	11.00 Mr. Ganbold, Civil Council of Environmental NGOs, Board Member of Civil Council of Environmental NGOs

Ms. Otgontsetseg, M., Board Member of
Civil Council of EnvironmentalNGOs

Ms.Nandintsetseg Administration officer
of Civil Council of Environmental NGOs

14.00 Associate Prof. Altansukh,
Department of Geography, National
University of Mongolia – 91993096

15:30 Mr. J.Batbold, Secretary of
Environment, MEGD

24
October

14:00 Mr. Tulga, Vice Minister of
Environment and Green Development,
MEGD

15:30 Ms. Ongonsar ADB environment
officer

25
October

First findings meeting with UNDP and
Ministry of Environment and Green
Development

28
October

14: 30 Mr. Batjav, Director of the
Department of Monitoring, Evaluation and
Internal Auditing

15:30 Mr. Dagvadorj Mongolia Special
Envoy for Climate Change, Head of the
Climate Change, MEGD

29
October

Departure, International Consultant from
Ulaanbaatar

31
October

Arrival International Consultant, Buenos
Aires, Argentina

List of documents reviewed

- Asian Development Bank (ADB), *Country Partnership Strategy Mongolia 2012-2016*, March 2012.
- Asian Development Bank (ADB), *Country Operations Business Plan 2012-2014*, March 2012.
- Assessment report on Climate Change (MNET, UNEP and UNDP), *Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia*, 2010.
- Brochure of Environmental Laws (MEGD), *Prepared by Bunchinjav.P, Officer of Division for Environmental Impact Assessment and Audit, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia*, 2012.
- Capacity Building Action Plan, Environmental Auditing (MEGD and UNDP), *Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia ((UNDP, UNEP, MNET and AusAID), Phase II, Ulaanbaatar*, June 2013.
- Cost Benefit Analysis of mining sites of Mongolia (UNDP, UNEP, MNET and AusAID), *Annual Report -2011, Ulaanbaatar*, February 2012.
- Cost Benefit Analysis of mining sites of Mongolia (UNDP, UNEP, MNET and AusAID), *Annual Report -2012, Ulaanbaatar*, February 2012.
- Cost Benefit Analysis of mining Sector (MNET and UNDP), *Phase II, Final Report, Ulaanbaatar*, November 2012.
- Climate Change Adaptation in Mongolia, Volume 2013 Issue 1 (MEGD, UNEP, GEF, UNEP RISOE centre, DTU ND Asian Institute of Technology), *Mongolia*, 2013.
- Climate Change Mitigation in Mongolia, Volume 2013 Issue 2 (MEGD, UNEP, GEF, UNEP RISOE centre, DTU ND Asian Institute of Technology), *Mongolia*, 2013.
- Environmental Audit Training Manual (MEGD and UNDP), *Prepared by James Lenoci, International Consultant, Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (UNDP, UNEP, MNET and AusAID), Phase II*, 2013.
- National Action Program on Climate Change (MEGD and UNDP), *Ulaanbaatar*, 2012.

- Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (MEGD and UNDP), *Phase II Project MON/11/301, Annual Report -2011*, January 2012.
- Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (MEGD and UNDP), *Phase II Project MON/11/301, Annual Report -2012*, January 2013.
- Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia ((UNDP, UNEP, MNET and AusAID), Phase II UNDP/UNEP Joint Project document, September 2011.
- Strengthening Environmental Governance in Mongolia (MEGD and UNDP), *Phase II Project MON/11/301, Project Completion Report (2011-2013)*, June 2013.
- Training Manual for Environmental Auditing (MEGD and UNDP), *Ulaanbaatar*, 2013.
- UNDP, “Guidance on Outcome-Level Evaluation”, December 2011.
- UNDP, *Frequently Asked Questions: The UNDP Approach to Supporting Capacity Development*, Capacity Development Group Bureau for Development Policy United Nations Development Programme, June 2009.
- UNDP, “Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, 2009, Available at: <http://www.undp.org/co/handbook>.
- Байгаль орчны стратеги үнэлгээ (сургалтын гарын авлага), БОНХЯ ба Монгол Улс дах НҮБ-ын Хөгжлийн программын газар, Улаанбаатар хот, 2013.
- Л.Батжав, Э.Болормаа, Хээл хахууль, авилга, ашиг сонирхлын зөрчил, Улаанбаатар, 2012.
- Уул уурхайн зардал, үр ашгийн шинжилгээ (сургалтын гарын авлага), БОНХЯ ба Монгол Улс дах НҮБ-ын Хөгжлийн программийн газар, Улаанбаатар хот, 2013.

List of Persons Interviewed

	Name	Title
UNDP in Mongolia		
1	Thomas Eriksson	Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP
2	Ms. Bunchingiv B	UNDP CO Environment Team leader,
Ministry of Environment and Green Development (MEGD)		
3	Mr.Batbold.J	State Secretary
4	Mr. Batbold,D	Alternate project National Director/Director, Division of International Cooperation
5	Mr.Tulga B.	Deputy Minister
6	Ms. BulganT	Director General, Department of Green Development Policy and Planning
7	Ms. BunchinjavP..	Officer, Division of Environmental impact Assessment and Audit
8	Ms.ErdenetsetsegS.	Officer, Division of Environmental impact Assessment and Audit
9	Ms.Khandarmaa D.	National coordinator of the “Strengthening environmental governance in Mongolia” Phase II
Non-Governmental Organizations		
10	Mr. Ganbold,	Board Member of Civil Council of Environmental NGOs
11	Ms.Otgontsetseg.M	Board Member of Civil Council of Environmental NGOs
12	Ms.Nandintsetseg	Administration officer of Civil Council of Environmental NGOs
13	Ms. Gunjidmaa.G	Head of Research and Information Department, Press Institute
Others		
14	Mr.AltansukhO.	Head of School of Geography, National University of Mongolia
15	Ms.Ongonsaran,	Environmental specialist, Mongolia Resident Mission, ADB

Evaluation Questionnaire

"STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE IN MONGOLIA" Project

1. What has the STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE IN MONGOLIA project achieved in terms of concrete results / products?
2. What has the project achieved in terms of processes?
3. Are the results and effects likely to continue now that the project itself has ended?
4. What was the most positive aspect of the project?
5. What was the most negative aspect?
6. Looking back, what would you have changed in order to improve the project?
7. What other recommendations would you make for future projects like the Strengthening Environmentla Governance in Mongolia Project?

-

Please feel free to make recommendations regarding type of projects, ways to implement, or subjects and areas of work .

ANNEX E: 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 Form²¹

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

Name of Consultant: Maria
Onestini

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): UNDP **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: Buenos Aires, Argentina September 26 2013

²¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct