1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	3235
IA/EA Project ID	
Focal Area	Land Degradation
Project Name	CACILM Rangeland Ecosystem Management-under CACILM Partnership Framework, Phase 1
Country/Countries	Kazakhstan
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNDP
Executing Agencies involved	Ministry of Environmental Protection
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 15: Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management LD 3: Investing in innovative approaches in SLM
TER Prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Kumar Negi
Author of TE	Lamia Mansour
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	01/08/2006
Project Implementation Start Date	01/04/2009
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	31/03/2012
Actual Date of Project Completion	01/03/2012
TE Completion Date	03/06/2012
IA Review Date	N/A
TE Submission Date	11/12/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.05	0.05
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.09	0.09
Total Project Prep Financing	0.14	0.14
GEF Financing	0.95	0.95
IA/EA own	0.05	0.05
Government	1.90	2.64
Other*	0.86	0.99
Total Project Financing	3.76	4.63
Total Financing including Prep	3.90	4.77

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	N/A	HS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	HL	N/A	HL
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	HS	N/A	HS
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	HS	N/A	HS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	N/A	HS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

According to the Project appraisal, the project's overall objective is the “Demonstration of good practice in rangeland management that promotes both the ecological integrity of natural grasslands and rural livelihood, and serves as a model for replicating Sustainable Rangeland Management (SRM) throughout the country”.

The expected principle impact is to manage Kazakhstan’s vast rangelands so that they provide a stable supply of products from livestock for consumption and processing, to contribute to ecosystem integrity and securing sustainable incomes and support to the reduction of poverty among the most affected population. Degradation caused by over-grazing of areas close to villages and farms and underutilization of remote rangelands will be stopped and reversed, resulting in a balanced use of rangelands with positive impacts on global environmental issues.

The project appraisal states that "the project envisages reviving mobile grazing systems, including a supportive legal and institutional environment, technical assistance, facilitation of organizational agreements and support for investments into the local infrastructure".

In terms of global environmental benefits, the project will be supportive of mitigating climate change impacts through stabilizing and rehabilitating carbon pools in soil and above-ground vegetation. It will also help conserve globally significant biodiversity including typical steppe formations with rich communities of turf graminoids.

No changes to the global environmental objectives are reported either in the Terminal Evaluation or last PIR.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

According to the project log frame in the appraisal document, the long-term development goal of the project is "to enhance the enabling environment and capacity for arresting land degradation and establishing sustainable land management practice of the rangeland ecosystem(s) and its services through conservation and sustainable use, so as to contribute to

enhancing ecosystem health, integrity, functions and services while promoting sustainable livelihoods in Kazakhstan."

The project's immediate objective is to "build capacity of the institutions for development and implementation of a coherent land policy and to promote sustainable and viable traditional pastureland management systems".

During implementation of the project, the directly measurable impact will be restricted to the pilot area. However, a much broader impact is expected through the dissemination and replication of the result of the project. CACILM will be used as a vehicle to mainstream Sustainable Rangeland Management into other government-funded and donor-funded operations in the field of Sustainable Livestock Management.

The project log frame is composed of four outcomes, with the associated outputs and activities, which contribute towards achieving the project objective and the demonstration of best practice of sustainable rangeland management. The project outcomes are the following:

(1) An environment which is conducive to Sustainable Rangeland Management (SRM) enhanced at the central and local level.

(2) Capacities and knowledge on integrated SRM of local government, community-based structures and individual farmers strengthened.

(3) Local infrastructure that allows greater mobility of livestock herds improved.

(4) Learning, evaluation and adaptive management, implemented.

No changes to the Development Objectives or outcomes are reported in the Terminal Evaluation or last PIR.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	No	

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance* – ***Satisfactory***

This project is focused on enhancing the legal environment for strengthening sustainable pastureland management systems, as well as improving institutional, technical, and local capacity for implementing SRM, and increasing the awareness of land degradation and sustainable land management issues among all stakeholders and civil society. Therefore, this project is highly relevant to the Operational Program 15 of the GEF that is focused on Sustainable Land Management.

Project outcomes are also consistent with the Republic of Kazakhstan's national priorities and commitments. The project is relevant to the Long-Term Strategy 2030 Environment and Natural Resources, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, the Concept of Environmental Safety for 2004-2015, and also the program on Environment Protection of Kazakhstan for 2008-2010.

Moreover, Kazakhstan has recognized the trans boundary nature of its land degradation problems and the benefits of a multi-country approach in the development and adoption of the Sub regional Action Program for Central Asian Countries on Combating Desertification and Drought.

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Highly *Satisfactory***

The significant impacts of the project, measured by the impact indicators at the level of the project objective, confirmed that the project has achieved its objective:

(1) Reduction of the area affected by soil erosion in selected plots around the pilot village, by 23.35%.

(2) Income of families involved in the project improved by 32.3%.

According to the Terminal Evaluation report, "these important results were achieved with minimal and appropriate investments which proved the efficiency and effectiveness of the project intervention, but also prove that catalytic support is needed for promoting the adherence of local population to SRM principles and to reach positive results in SRM".

The project was able to achieve good results and is therefore rated as highly satisfactory. The project was successful with development of a number of by-laws and government policies on sustainable land management. It prepared recommendations for the new Law on Pasture. It also invested considerable efforts in improving pasture infrastructure including the provision of yurts, solar generator, satellite telephone to herders, and restoration of wells at distant pastures. The project joined forces with JSC "KazAgroInnovation" and its centers for knowledge dissemination, trainings and conferences to replicate project achievements in different regions of Kazakhstan. The project gained high visibility at local and national levels and in mass media. The project has attained its development objective and outcomes.

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Highly *Satisfactory***

The project efficiency is rated as highly satisfactory for the following reasons;

(1) The project has succeeded in disbursing its financial resources by the date of its completion.

(2) The Final Evaluation also confirmed that the distribution of the expenditures have been in line with the planned allocations at the level of the project outcomes.

(3) The project experienced very few delays, the only one mentioned in the Terminal Evaluation report is that initially the planned starting date was September 2008, and the project actually started in April 2009. The implementation start date was delayed but the total length of the project was not modified. Therefore the project did not suffered from this delay.

Overall the efficiency is rated as highly satisfactory because, the results confirm that the duration of the project has been realistic; although the project has set a very ambitious plan for the delivery of pilot activities as well as policy and institutional reform, the financial and schedule targets of the project have been met.

5.4. *Sustainability* – ***No/Negligible Risks***

Institutional framework and governance risks:

The project has succeeded in addressing some of the key policy barriers by supporting the promotion of relevant legal frameworks at relevant institutions.

The grazing rules which were established with the project support continue to be used as an operational basis by the members of the Pasture Committees. The Pasture Committees have evolved into a more institutional set up.

Some examples of legal frameworks that will ensure the project sustainability are:

(1) Decree 1287/2011 application under the Land Code related to the rational use of agricultural lands and pastures was developed with project support and approved by government in 2011,

(2) MoA has established an Interagency Committee in March 2012 for the development of the Pasture Law based on technical recommendations from the project.

(3) MEP included the principles and approaches for SRM into the "ZHASYL DAMU" (Green Development) Intersectoral Program for 2010-2014 which has already been ratified by the Government.

(4) At the time of Terminal Evaluation writing, a follow up programme on SRM was planned to be launched mid-2012 at the level of the Research Institute for Livestock and Feed Production of the KazAgroInnovation Centre based on the project activities

Financial risks:

The leverage created by the project is clear, the interest and action for follow up are integrated in national plans and programmes. For example, MoA is launching an investment program on “Developing of remote rangeland for period from 2013 up to 2015. The objective of the program is to disseminate SRM project achievements in different regions of Kazakhstan on the base of republic budget.

Socio political risks:

At the time of Terminal Evaluation writing the training of trainers of the KaAgroInnovation Centres on SRM was planned to be conducted in 2012 through the Capacity Building Component of the CACILM project based the project's training modules.

Moreover the Pasture Committees changed into a cooperative or a public fund in order to benefit from Governmental procedures and support for such structures. Stakeholders agree that the Pasture Committees don't benefit from legally approved functions, but they remain an important transitional step needed for the mobilization of local farmers into legally recognized structures.

Environmental risks:

No environmental risks are reported in the Terminal Evaluation or PIRs.

6. Impact assessment

6.1. *Impacts related to knowledge and information sharing*

- 6.1.1. Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge generation?
- 6.1.2. Is there evidence that this knowledge was used for management or governance?
- 6.1.3. Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?
- 6.1.4. Is there evidence that these outputs were used?
- 6.1.5. Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?
- 6.1.6. Was any positive change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?
- 6.1.7. Did the project's activities contribute to building technical and/or environmental management skills?
- 6.1.8. Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

6.2. *Impacts related to governance*

- 6.2.1. Did the project contribute to the development of legal/policy/regulatory frameworks?
- 6.2.2. Were these frameworks adopted?
- 6.2.3. Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?
- 6.2.4. Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?
- 6.2.5. Did the project contribute to structures/mechanisms/processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?
- 6.2.6. Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?
- 6.2.7. Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

6.3. *Broader adoption of implementation strategies*

6.3.1. Did replication of the promoted technologies/mechanisms take place?
6.3.2. Did scaling-up of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?
6.3.3. Did mainstreaming of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?
6.3.4. Did removal or market barriers and sustainable market change take place?

6.4. *GEF's catalytic role*

6.4.1. Project classification based on project components:

6.5. *Environmental stress reduction and changes in environmental status*

6.5.1. Was environmental stress reduction achieved?
6.5.1.1. If so, at what scale?
6.5.1.2. How was the information obtained?
6.5.1.3. Evidence of stress reduction:
6.5.2. Was there a change in environmental status as a result of the project?
6.5.2.1. If so, at what scale?
6.5.2.2. How was the information obtained?
6.5.2.3. Evidence of a change in environmental status:

6.6. *Impact monitoring and reporting*

6.6.1. Where arrangements to collect data on environmental stress reduction in place?
6.6.2. Were arrangements to collect data on socioeconomic status in place?
6.6.3. Describe arrangements:
6.6.4. To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?
6.6.5. Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?
6.6.6. Describe arrangements:
6.6.7. Was there a government body or permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and socioeconomic status?
6.6.8. Has the monitoring data been used for management?
6.6.9. Describe how monitoring data has been used for management:
6.6.10. Has the data been made accessible to the public?
6.6.11. Describe the ways in which data has been made accessible to the public:

6.7. *Socio-economic impacts*

6.7.1. Did the project contribute to positive socioeconomic impacts?
6.7.1.1. If so, at what scale?
6.7.1.2. How was the information obtained?
6.7.2. Did the project contribute to negative socioeconomic impacts?
6.7.2.1. If so, at what scale?
6.7.2.2. How was the information obtained?
6.7.3. Evidence of socioeconomic impacts:

7. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

7.1. *Co-financing*

7.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

The financial planning has been in line with the planned allocations at the level of the project outcomes; confirming alignment of project activities with set objectives and the set outcomes of the projects.

Funding of the project appears to have been well integrated since the outcomes have been achieved. Co-financing contributions supported project activities that made possible a sustainable use of land, focused on adopting innovative and sustainable livestock, pasture, soil and water management practices, enhanced stakeholder participation, knowledge and awareness of SRM through information sharing and networking, conservation of biological diversity of global significance, and restoration and long-term protection of critically degraded ecosystems.

7.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project has exceeded the planned resources committed at its outset and has mobilized double the commitments from the Republican Budget and from Germany through GIZ. Other sources of co-financing which were committed in the project design were also maintained by the project partners, and included co-financing from farmers, Public Scientific Center LR and LM and Washington State University. These additional sources of funding assured the sustainability of the project, and the results delivery.

(1) $2.615 million were mobilized from the Republican Budget (compared to $1.348 million initially planned), and were used for additional infrastructure improving the sustainability of the project, including streets and settlements lightning, social services, water facilities, roads rehabilitation, play lots, subsidies for agriculture development (livestock, milk and wool processing, crops seeding).

(2) $0.948 million from Germany through GIZ (compared to $0.4 million initially planned), the Terminal Evaluation does not report how this additional resource were used.

Other sources of co-financing which have been maintained by the project partners were used to fulfill the project outcomes, and include:

(1) $0.012m Farmers of Kazakhstan, used for consultations, conduction of trainings and seminars.

(2) $0.027m from Public Scientific Center LR and LM, used for agricultural lands monitoring (soil and geo-botanical surveys).

(3) $0.034m from Washington State University, used for photo electric system, wind generator, water purifying station, equipment for milk processing and keeping

7.2. Delays

7.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

This project is an integral part of CACILM CPP which was approved by the GEF Council in August 2006 and arises from the Kazakh National Program Framework (NPF). It was initially planned to start in September 2008. However, due to several reasons, including the resignation of the original project manager in September 2007, the change of the GIZ consultant and delay in approval and signature of the project proposal, the project inception phase took place between January-April 2009, and the inception workshop was held in April 2009. The project duration of 36 months was followed as initially planned, and therefore these had no impact on the overall project achievements.

7.3. Country ownership

7.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The project is consistent with the Republic of Kazakhstan's national priorities and commitments as stated in its Long-Term Strategy 2030 "Environment and Natural Resources", National Program for Combating Desertification (2005-2015), National Environmental Action Plan, as well as its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Concept of Environmental Safety for 2004-2015, approved by Presidential Decree on December 2003.

Kazakhstan also recognized the transboundary nature of its land degradation problems and the benefits of a multi-country approach in the development and adoption of the Subregional Action Program for Central Asian Countries on Combating Desertification and Drought (SRAP-CD) in 2003, which focuses on country-level actions. According to the Terminal Evaluation report, "the Programme serves both as evidence of country ownership and conformity with eligibility criteria under the UNCCD, as well as a point of reference in devising effective national strategies to promote SLM". Kazakhstan has also adopted a National Environmental Action Plan, in which land degradation is a prominent issue.

8. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

8.1. *M&E design at entry* – ***Highly Satisfactory***

The M&E design at Entry is rated highly satisfactory, it was of high quality and very useful in the overall project achievements.

It was planned to follow the UNDP Programming Manual and GEF M&E procedures and be conducted by the project team and the UNDP Country Office with support from UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bratislava.

M&E was planned to follow the principles of outcome evaluations, to provide an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions.

At entry, the M&E plan includes inception report, Annual Progress Reports, quarterly operational reports, as well as mid-term and final evaluations.

The impact of the project were planned to be measured through participatory impact monitoring by the target group.

8.2. *M&E implementation* - ***Highly Satisfactory***

The M&E plan implementation is rated as highly satisfactory because the project has been able to establish adequate and periodic oversight of activities during its implementation through the delivery of necessary monitoring and reporting requirements based on agreed activities and indicators. The project has successfully used its logical framework as a management tool during implementation and made necessary changes as a response to changing conditions obtained from M&E activities. The project has deployed necessary resources for tracking the key impact indicators which has significantly contributed to the analysis and assessment of the project achievement, specifically with regards to the impact of the project on soil erosion and vegetation cover of the rangelands and income of families involved in the project. The M&E plan implementation highly contributed to the overall project achievements.

9. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

9.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution* ***– Highly Satisfactory***

9.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation* – ***Highly Satisfactory***

The overall quality of implementation is highly satisfactory. The project implementation was in line with the project design as planned in the project document. The design and implementation strategy have ensured effective delivery of project outcomes. There were no shortcomings in terms of results.

The supervision and the quality of management were of high quality, as demonstrated by the following examples: the PSC has convened as required at least once per year and reviewed the annual project performance, the PMU location allowed proximity to the pilot areas and sustained close linkages to the central administration of the MoA, the UNDP has followed National Execution modalities in project implementation, and GIZ has adopted its own direct execution modalities in project implementation.

Overall, the project has adopted a good basis for adaptive management by developing realistic work plans, using these work plans as a basis for operation, and providing clear and regular monitoring and reporting requirements.

9.3. *Overall Quality of Execution*- **Highly Satisfactory**

The quality of execution is rated highly satisfactory.

The Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) was appointed as the National Executing Agency and was successful in delivering the planned activities and studies. The MoA was highly involved in the project with the visits of some of its members to the Suusamyr Pasture Project, and participation at conferences. MoA is also really invested in the project sustainability, launching an investment program on “Developing of remote rangeland for period from 2013 up to 2015".

Moreover, the work of the executing agency was of good quality because the administration and financial statements were available and well monitored during the project period, the project supervision was consistent throughout the project, the M&E procedures were followed as planned, and finally the PIR were delivered and used as monitoring tools as convened.

10. Lessons and recommendations

10.1. *Key lessons*

10.2. *Key recommendations*

11. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Highly Satisfactory**	The outcomes and impacts of the project are very well described. Summary of indicators and results per outcome are realized through easy to read tables, and details are given in the text. The report is strong in terms of assessing relevant outcomes and impacts. The analysis is straight forward and well justified.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Highly Satisfactory**	The report relevance is highly satisfactory because the report is internally consistent, and the evidence are complete and convincing. Each result is documented, with the means of verification described. Each objective, outcome, and result are rated, and substantiated with evidences.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Satisfactory**	The report assesses the overall sustainability of the project. However, it does not mention anything about the environmental sustainability. In such projects, with a primary objective being "Demonstration of good practice in rangeland management that promotes both ecological integrity of natural grasslands and local livelihood", the environmental sustainability is an important aspect of whether the project impacts will be continued or used in the future. Therefore, a part on environmental sustainability should have been developed in details.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Highly Satisfactory**	The lessons learned are supported by the evidences and by the results and impacts of the project.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Satisfactory**	The report includes a detailed assessment of co-financing, and gives some examples of how co-financing was used. However, the project costs is not described in details for each activity.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Satisfactory**	The implementation of the M&E system is well described, however, the M&E design at entry is not mention nor rated in the Terminal Evaluation report.

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?	Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The availability of infrastructure in remote pastures to improve grazing in remote pasture based on proposals by the local population; rehabilitation of 7 wells in distant pastures, provision of 25 yurt, 1 living trailer, 4 solar battery, 13 photoelectrical solar batteries, 1 satellite phone, 24 first aid kits for herders, planting of 932 hectares of perennial grasses on degraded land.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?	No

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

An extensive information and communication campaign was implemented by the project to disseminate information on SRM to local government, community-based organizations and individual farmers:
(1) Round table on SRM problems with participation of national and international partners, decision-makers and other stakeholders;
(2) Press -Tour for Mass Media representatives with visits to the project sites.
(3) An International Scientific Practice Conference was organized with the participation of representatives from different Central Asia countries, decision-makers and other stakeholders where successful results of the SRM project were presented.
(4) Project's website www.zhailau.kz.
(5) Kazakh Model for Sustainable Rangeland Management was developed and published in 2011.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?	No

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?	Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

More than 3000 information material were distributed in 3 years during the lifetime of the project (28 communication activities, 257 publications, 30 interviews on TV channels, 21 programmes broadcasted on TV devoted to effective rangelands management, documentary named “Ken Dala”, quarterly the project results posted on the project website, one information bulletin).

4 exchange visits involving key target groups related to SRM were conducted:
(1) 40 participants of Camp-Forum visited the project site to meet with farmers and members of the Pasture Committee,
(2) A study tour of the international conference on pastoralism of UCA in Kyrgyzstan was organized (5 members of Ministry of Environment, MoA and Farmer's Union visited the Suusamyr Pasture Project and exchanged experience in pasture management and with regards to the Kyrgyz law on rangelands),
(3) Exchange visits to other projects were organized within the frameworks of the Field Trip Program of the International Scientific-Practical Conference “Experience of introduction of innovative approaches for sustainable agriculture management at favorable areas” in 2009. 4 representatives from the target groups participated in the conference. A field trip was organized to the farm “Karanaiza” and to LLP “Kaz-Zher” in Akmola Oblast.
(4) A visit to East Kazakhstan region on Altay Sayan Mountain Biodiversity Project was conducted in 2010 for the chairman of pasture committee, the district department of agriculture and the project expert for rangeland management.

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?	No

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?	Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO ***TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS*** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

193 people were successfully trained. Several seminars and trainings were conducted and are the following:
(1) A seminar on SRM was organized by the project for 99 villagers and 16 persons from other regions. The participants also include 4 Mayors of rural areas, 4 chairman of Pasture Committee and 1 deputy of mayor of district.
(2) A seminars on "Veterinary and livestock health" and "Processing and keeping of livestock products" was organized jointly with "Ushkonyr" Knowledge Dissemination Center of JSC Kazagroinnovation for 28 head veterinary specialists in all Rural district, on 15-19.02.2010.
(3) Four trainings were organized on SRM based on the CAMP Alatoo on learning tool for the restoration of degraded lands in Zhambyl rayon jointly with Ushkonir Knowledge Dissemination Center of JSC Kazagroinnovation. Livestock specialists, farmers, heads of farms, representatives from akimats, students of Kazakh Agrarian University of Almaty, Zhambyl and South-Kazakhstan oblast took part in it. 46 participants successfully completed the training.
(4) A specialized training on "Greenhouse keeping" was conducted from 22-26.02.2010 for 3 participants and on "Sheep breeding" from 15-19.03.2010 for 1 participant.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?	No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?	Yes
Were these adopted?	Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

At the time of Terminal Evaluation writing, several legal frameworks had been adopted or were on their way to be adopted with the project support:
(1) Application Decree 1287/2011 under the Land Code related to the rational use of agricultural lands and pastures was developed with project support and approved by government in 2011.
(2) MoA established an Interagency Committee in March 2012 for the development of the Pasture Law based on technical recommendations from the project.
(3) Grazing rules for rangelands for the villages involved in the Project were approved by the Pasture Committees. Agreements were signed between Akimat, Pasture Committees and pasture users based on these rules.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?	Yes
Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?	Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

4 Pasture Committees were established in 2009 in the selected pilot rural districts, based on open election of members at joint meetings of pasture resources users. Statute of the Pasture Committees were approved by pasture resources users, local authorities, and institutions responsible for project implementation.
In May 2010, first meetings of Pasture Committees were held to plan needed improvements of the pasture management and infrastructure.
Three out of four of the pasture committees have become cooperatives and 1 pasture committee became a public fund. By the end of the project, all of the Pasture Committees evolved into legally registered functions at the local agency of the Ministry of Justice.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

No

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

During project development, an extensive identification of stakeholders and beneficiaries was conducted. The project closely involved these institutions in the development and implementation of the project's objective and activities, through concrete cooperation and financial commitment.
Moreover, the project had put in place extensive information dissemination and training programmes involving keys national stakeholders, such as information activities and publications, seminars and trainings, exchange visits, concrete cooperation with concerned stakeholders in the implementation of project activities.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

Yes

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION? WHAT RESULTED FROM
THESE?

4 agreements on grazing management were made between project, Pasture Committees, akimats and pasture users of 4 rural districts.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	minimum tillage and no-till technologies, rehabilitation of pasture infrastructure, development of remote rangeland for renewal of livestock mobility, development of renewable and alternative sources of energy in the remote rangeland

Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	
Financial Mechanisms	No	

Did r**eplication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place? Yes

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

6 projects have used the experience of this project in their activities. These include new projects in different countries of Central Asia which were recently developed including 2 projects in Kyrgyzstan, 1 project in Turkmenistan, 1 project Uzbekistan and 2 projects in Kazakhstan. The fields of intervention of these projects which benefited from the SRM project included production of fodder in unused and degraded lands through the adoption of minimum tillage and no-till technologies, rehabilitation of pasture infrastructure, development of remote rangeland for renewal of livestock mobility, development of renewable and alternative sources of energy in the remote rangeland, etc.
Joint of activities were also developed with the Multi-country Capacity Building Project of CACILM, which has planned follow up of project activities in 2012 covering the following activities of the SRM project :
(1) Training of trainers of the KazAgro Innovation Knowledge and Dissemination Centers based on the SRM training module developed by the Project
(2) Continuation of the support for the development of the Pasture law

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Scaling up of the promoted approaches has not taken place yet. However, the project has been able to develop a clear and relevant strategy and action for removing the barriers to SRM by creating an enabling environment and capacities at local, provincial, as well as central levels to provide models which can be used in the wider context in Kazakhstan as well as in CACILM for SRM.

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did r**emoval of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? | No |

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Combination *<--dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

Institutional Capacity (governance) & Implementation Strategies *<--dropdown menu*

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved? | Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

X	Local	X	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

X	Measured		Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status? | No

If so, Please mark 'x' for all that

at what scales?	apply					
	☐	Local	☐	Intended (local)	☐	Unintended (local)
	☐	Systemic	☐	Intended (systemic)	☐	Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	☐	Measured	☐	Anecdotal		

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Reduction of the area affected by soil erosion in selected plots around the pilot village, by 23.35%.
Reduction of the area affected by unwanted plant species due to under grazing of 8.6%.
Transhumant pastures increased more than 45 000 ha i.e. around 19.7 % of the total area of the remote pastures.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental	Yes

Socioeconomic	Yes

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

(1) first geo-botanic research; produced several maps describing pasture yield and use, leading to recommendations for the seasonal rotations and the determination of agricultural types.
(2) field surveys conducted by the project in 2009, 2010 and 2011
(3) A survey of the socio economic situation, establishes a methodology for analysis of the situation of areas involved in the project and makes recommendations for improving the living conditions and economic situation of these areas.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

The geo botanic research was conducted in three stages:
(1) collection of archive, literature and cartographic materials determining study of the natural conditions of the surveyed area,
(2) mapping of vegetation, plotting geo-botanic contours, description of plant associations related to the types of pasture land, relief, and dynamic capacities related to certain conditions of the nature (relief and soils).
(3) A photographic method of geo-botanic materials.

The socio economic situation survey used official data from Statistics Unit of Zhambyl district, Akimats of village districts, as well as institutions of education, health care, culture and etc. Other information were obtained during meetings and interviews with heads of farming enterprises and representatives of small and medium size business and families. The method of free interview was used to identified a number of environmental (conflicts about natural resources, grazing of cattle and etc.) and socio-economic indicators.

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

No

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

No

Has the monitoring data been used for	No

management?

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public? No

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts? Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

X	Local	X	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

X	Measured		Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts? No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

	Local		Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information

	Measured		Anecdotal

obtained? ☐ ☐

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

521 families have benefited directly from the project and their income has improved by 32.3%.
Gender considerations have been introduced into project interventions as appropriate based on local specificities and technical feasibility.

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The project has achieved its objective and the main assets that it produced are the following:
(1) An appropriate technical basis for identification and responding to the main socio-economic barriers impeding systematic use of pasture lands. The main barriers were water and fodder shortage in pasture lands. The constraints were the old equipment, the insufficient information-marketing support from agricultural organizations, a breeding work not systematized, difficulties to receive credit work, and poor transport infrastructure.
(2) An appropriate institutional basis for local mobilization through Pasture Committees to regulate the use of pastures at the local level.
(3) The promotion of a balanced socio-economic development placing Sustainable Rangeland Management at its center with other opportunities for alternatives types of socio-economic activities and a sustainable livelihood development process.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Two main recommendations are made by the Terminal Evaluation report:

(1) To continue the support for capacity development of national and local stakeholders. Regulatory and institutional barriers for Sustainable Rangeland Management have been identified to be the key issues that limit effective adoption of SRM principles and approaches in Kazakhstan. The project has supported several legal and institutional developments; however these efforts remain beyond necessary situation for reversing these barriers and ensuring necessary legal and institutional framework.

(2) To document key project outcomes. The project has developed and published several outcomes of the project, however an extensively rich information base remain available and merit a consolidation effort to ensure its availability for the general public.