

UNDP-GEF project “CACILM: Multi-country Capacity Building Project”

PIMS 3231 SLM FSP

Final Evaluation

December – February 2012

**Francis Hurst
Maya Eralieva
Khushbakht Hojiev
Tulkin Radjabov**

Acknowledgements

The FE would like to thank the UNDP CO Kyrgyzstan as well as the other participating COs, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan for their help and assistance in carrying out the evaluation.

The RPMU and country PMUs gave considerably of their time, experience and insight. An interesting and refreshing aspect of this project has been the openness and honesty with which the evaluators were treated by the participants, indeed the FE has been impressed by the desire of all the participants to understand what has not worked, why and how it might work in the future which indicates a certain robustness in the relation, despite the many problems it has faced and gives much hope for the future.

The FE also thanks the staff and TA of GIZ for their help, advice and insight, echoing the sentiments expressed above.

During the FE a large number of stakeholders were consulted, too numerous to list here. However, the FE expresses its gratitude to the all those listed in Annex 7 of this report for their time, advice, insight and honesty in responding to the FE. A remarkable aspect of the MCB has been the obvious affection that many stakeholders have for the project and the sometimes passionate desire to address the complex issues of land management in their countries and within the region.

Lastly the Lead Consultant would like to thank the three National Consultants Maya Eralieva (Kyrgyzstan) Khushbakht Hojiev (Tajikistan) and Tulkin Radjabov (Uzbekistan) for their hard work, guidance and analysis of information.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
APR	Annual Progress Report
BRC	Bratislava Regional Centre
CACILM	Central Asian Initiative for Land Management
CMPF	CACILM Multi-country Framework Project
CO	Country Office
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
FE	Final Evaluation
FSP	Full-sized Project
FSU	Former Soviet Union
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GM	Global Mechanism
GoT	Government of Tajikistan
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
Ha	Hectare(s)
HEP	Hydro Electric Power
LFM	Log Frame Matrix
MTE	Mid-term Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NPM	National Project Manager
MCB	Multi-country Capacity Building project
PDF-A	Project Development Facility – Block A
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMU	Project Management Unit
RPM	Regional Project Manager
RPMU	Regional Project Management Unit
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
TRAC	Target for Resource Assignments from the Core
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
MLF	Micro Loan Fund
OEC-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Cooperation Directorate
JRC	Jamoat Resource and Advocacy Centre
LFM	Logical Framework Matrix
WOCAT	World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies

Contents

1 Executive Summary	vi
Table summarising main ratings received	1
2 Introduction	1
2.2 Project background	1
2.1 Purpose of the evaluation	1
3 The Project and Its Development Context	3
3.1 The GEF Objective (GEF Operational Programme #15)	4
3.1 Description of the Project	4
3.2 Project Context	7
4 Findings and Conclusions	8
4.1 Project Formulation	9
4.1.1 Conceptualisation/Design	10
4.1.2 Results framework, risks and assumptions	11
4.1.3 Country ownership/Driveness	12
4.1.4 Stakeholder participation	13
4.1.5 Catalytic role and replication approach	14
4.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage	16
4.1.6 Linkages between other projects and interventions within the sector	16
4.1.6 Management arrangements	16
4.2 Project Implementation	17
4.2.1 Adaptive management	18
4.2.2 Partnership arrangements	20
4.2.3 Feedback from monitoring and evaluation used for adaptive management	21
4.2.4 Financial Planning	21
Table 1 Planned versus actual spending (GEF budget)	1
Table 2 Co-financing planned versus actual	2
4.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation	1
Table 3 Project monitoring and evaluation	2
4.2.6 Implementation and execution modalities, coordination and operational issues	3
4.3 Results	5
4.3.1 Attainment of Outcomes/Achievements of Objectives	6

Table 4 Project Scoring by Outcome and Output Indicators of Project Document/Inception Report	7
4.3.2 Relevance	20
4.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency	20
4.3.4 Country ownership.....	21
4.3.5 Mainstreaming.....	22
4.3.6 Sustainability	22
4.3.7 Impact	23
5 Recommendations	24
6 Lessons Learned	27
Annexes.....	29
Annex 1 Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation	29
Annex 2 Itinerary List of Meetings & People Met.....	38
Annex 3 Documents Reviewed	46
Annex 4 Country LFMs & Results	47
Annex 5 List of MCB Publications.....	114
Annex 6 Resume of FE Team.....	115
Annex 7 Comments by stakeholder on First Draft report.....	117
Annex 7: Stakeholders’ Comments to First Draft Evaluation Report and Response from Evaluation Team.....	117
Annex 8 Declaration.....	124

1 Executive Summary

Project Title	CACILM Multi-country Capacity Building \project			
GEF Project ID	3231		At endorsement (million US\$)	At completion (million US\$)
UNDP Project ID	3790	GEF financing	2,865,000	
Country	Kyrgyzstan (KY), Kazakhstan (KZ), Tajikistan (TJ), Turkmenistan (TK), & Uzbekistan (UZ)	IA/EA Own	1,961,500	1,354,424
Region	Central Asia	Government	KY 150,000	120,600
			KZ 100,000	150,000
			TK 100,000	80,000
			TJ 100,000	150,000
			UZ 100,000	102,635
Focal Area	LD	Other	GIZ 500,000	1,291,259
			GM 300,000	120,000
FA Objectives (OP/SP)	OP 15/SP SLM 2	Total co-financing	3,311,500	
Executing Agency	UNDP	Total project costs	6,176,500	
Other partners involved	GIZ, GM	Project Document signature		10.12.2009
		Operation closing date	Proposed 31.12.2012	Actual: 02.2013

1. This report provides an account and the findings and conclusions of the Final Evaluation (FE) of the UNDP-GEF Project (PIMS 3231 SLM FSP) Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land management: Multicountry Capacity Building Project that is being directly implemented by United Nations Development Programme in five Central Asian countries; Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.
2. The field work for the TE took place from the 27th November to the 18th December 2012 and was carried out by two independent Consultants (National and International). The evaluation process consisted of studying the project's documentation, field visits and interviews with project stakeholders and a detailed analysis of the findings.

Purpose of the Final Evaluation

3. Evaluation is an integral part of the UNDP-GEF project cycle management. The TE is guided by its Terms of Reference and UNDP-GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures. The evaluation process is independent of both UNDP and GEF and the opinions and recommendations in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the GEF, UNDP, or the Project Management Unit, however, once accepted the TE becomes a recognised component of the project's documentation.
4. The TE addressed a number of key issues such as:
 - The performance of the Project – has it done what it said it would do?
 - The effectiveness of the interventions – having done what it set out to do, has it worked?

- The impact of the Project – what are the outcomes now, and in the future, of the Project's intervention.

The CACILM Multi-country Capacity Building Project (MCB)

5. The GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM: Multi-country capacity building project was approved by GEF in 2009. The inception workshop was organized in March 2010. The project is a three-year SLM capacity building project being implemented in five Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). The project officially commenced in January 2010 and will terminate in February 2013.
6. The project is financed by the global environment facility (GEF) through its operational program for land degradation, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the GIZ GmbH, and the Global Mechanism of the UNCCD (GM). The project is directly executed (DIM) by UNDP CO in five Central Asian countries where UNDP CO Kyrgyzstan is a principal office. In GEF terminology it is a "full-size" project (FSP) *i.e.* it has a contribution from GEF exceeding US\$ 1 million. The total project is valued at US\$ 6,176,500 of which GEF financing is US\$ 2,865,000¹ in in-kind or cash contributions.
7. The **goal** of the project is: *the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD.*
8. The project **objective** is: *to increase capacity at the national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming Framework.*
9. The project is designed to produce four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.

Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 1.1: A strengthened inter-governmental structure to support SLM

Output 1.2: Fortified CACILM national-level structures and mechanism to support policy development and mainstreaming.

Output 1.3: Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing:

Output 1.4: Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies:

Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements.

Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 2.1 – Five national multi-stakeholder working groups are established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing [Integrated Financing Strategies] IFSS

Output 2.2 – Five Integrated Financing Strategies drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.

Output 2.3: Five SLM Investment Programs Developed:

Output 2.4: Five National Integrated Financing Strategies approved for implementation

Outcome 3: Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through human resource development.

Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

¹ Including the PDF B (project development grant US\$ 109,398)

Output 3.1: A national-level, long-term SLM Capacity Building Program approved by NCC.

Output 3.2: Approved Mechanisms for enhanced communication and coordination between state agencies and land users.

Output 3.3: Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.

Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened.

Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 4.1: National Learning Networks on best practices in collaborative SLM established and functioning.

Output 4.2 Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders.

Output 4.3: Effective system of upscaling and replication of good practices in collaborative SLM on national and regional level established and functional.

Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

10. The MCB has understandably been a troubled project. Unlike the other three elements (research, information systems (GIS) and knowledge management) of the CACILM the MCB was a marriage between three partners, each with different operation and procedural practices and operating at a multi-country level within a region where there is considerable uncertainty and unpredictability and importantly, unlike the first three elements of CACILM which were essentially addressing a technical challenge the MCB was addressing an adaptive challenge.
11. As such it was moving from capacity building as might be defined as a technical challenge towards capacity building as an adaptive challenge. In fact the project was moving further than capacity building as simply strengthening the status quo and addressing issues of governance; what is meant by governance in this instance is: "the means for achieving direction, control, and coordination that determines the effectiveness of management"².
12. Despite the troubles that it has faced, it is reasonable for the FE to state that the project has had a number of notable successes and made some significant progress, indeed, the project has provided some very important insight into the challenges of addressing land degradation within the region and the evaluators are pleased with the project's progress towards outcomes in the final months before closure. As a result the FE considers this overall a SATISFACTORY project which might have achieved much more given more time.

Recommendation 1: Adaptive management and the LFM

Responsibility: BRC & GEF.

13. The log frame matrix (LFM) is the principal planning and, monitoring and evaluation tool for GEF projects. As such it is very useful, but it is just a tool. It should be clearly recognised that the LFM serves two functions. Firstly it is a planning and monitoring tool establishing a logical hierarchy of objective, outcomes, outputs, and down to the level of activities necessary to achieve the objective. Furthermore, it develops indicators necessary to track progress and measure the

² Eagles, Paul F J, 2008, Governance models for parks, recreation, and tourism. In: Transforming Parks and Protected area: policy and governance in a changing world. Eds. Kevin S. Hanna, Douglas A. Clark, and D. Scott Slocombe.

effectiveness or impact of an intervention. However, it also functions as a contractual tool ensuring that there is conformity to the projects stated objective preventing "mission creep"³.

14. There should be clear guidelines drawn up to distinguish between the planning, monitoring and evaluation function of a project LFM and its contractual function. As the recommendation to improve project governance (see below) makes clear, projects are at the mercy of events, both internal and external. By their very nature GEF projects are operating in a highly dynamic, complex and unpredictable environment. They are interacting with multiple drivers, socio-political, economic and environmental. All subject to sudden change. This is why GEF works through an adaptive management approach and this is why sometimes an LFM may need to be realigned with the circumstances that the project is experiencing, or as assumptions made during the design do not hold true.

Recommendation 2: Complex projects should have dedicated monitoring and evaluation officers

Responsibility: BRC & GEF.

15. Future projects should include, in addition to the normal staffing compliment a dedicated Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. This need not be every project; however complex projects, and the MCB was undoubtedly complex, cannot rely on over-worked project managers or CTA to develop the monitoring programme. The project's Inception Report simply states that the situation has changed, re-states the monitoring and evaluation programme from the Project Document and then provides six more LFMs that are at variance with the original LFM. Clearly there is a need for a dedicated position for monitoring and evaluation if we are to subscribe to an adaptive management approach.

Recommendation 3: Developing the projects governance

Responsibility: UNDP, project Partner(s), BRC.

16. The speed at which decisions are made has to correspond to the speed of events. Imagine that a project is conceptualized in year one, designed over two years, might take a further year for approval and we might further add a year for other delays. By the time it actually starts "on the ground" events have invariably moved on. Therefore it needs a highly dynamic executive, with a clear understanding of its roles and responsibilities, and with rules for its operation. Guidelines for this are easily available from a number of sources, including the internet. Without effective governance even the best-planned project is liable to be shaped by both internal and external events rather than the other way around.
17. Therefore the FE recommends that the project governance, in this case the PSC, or Project Board as it became known as, should be properly constituted during the project development phase (including at least one meeting to constitute the membership) so that it is operational from the very start and particularly during the inception phase. This should include defining the membership and the formulation and signing of any substantive agreements between project partners.

Lessons Learned

Lesson1: There should be better use of the project cycle to enhance adaptive management

18. There are a number of critical phases in any GEF project that can affect its progress towards achieving the objective. Beginning with the project design these are: the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) review, the Inception Phase (including the Inception Workshop and

³ The expansion of a project or mission beyond its original objectives and goals.

report) and the Mid-term Review. Forget the Final Evaluation; it is really not important because by then it is too late. The difference is that all but the FE are part of the adaptive management process of the project; the FE is simply reporting what has happened. Projects should make better use of these critical phases, using the inception phase to challenge inconsistencies in the Project Document and if necessary "*calling in*" a MTR when a project is experiencing difficulties before the midpoint of the project.

Lesson 2: Team building, embedded technical assistance and personal development

19. A striking feature of the MCB has been the use of embedded TA providing a mentoring and training role to the national project staff. There are two aspects of this, the use of TA and the way in which the project personnel have responded by taking the experience and expanding it. The FE recognises that the use of embedded TA has not been uniform across the five countries and initially was not at the right level (*i.e.* embedded within the CBU(s)).
20. There is frequently an assumption in projects that project personnel should not benefit from any training and capacity building provided by the project. However, investment in human resources is almost always cost-effective and it is unreasonable to assume that national staff will necessarily have the requisite set of skills to prosecute a project. Providing good quality TA staff with training and mentoring mandate during the early stages of the project, possibly defined during the inception phase when an assessment of the skill needs can be made.

Lesson 3: Using a project as a service provider

21. One of the remarkable things about the MCB is that in many ways it has functioned as a service provider to other projects and initiatives. The FE considers that this was implicit in the project's design which is one reason that the FE has been cautious about criticising the design too much. The basic idea was good; the presentation in the Project Document was confusing (as well as being overly ambitious). However, what emerged is a project behaving as if it was a service provider both financially and technically. Using targeted inputs to other initiatives it has been able to expand these initiatives and also to extend them to different areas and across borders. A good example of this has been in the development of the Pasture Laws. While the basic law is not a product of the project per se; the enabling of the legislation and its implementation would not have happened as rapidly (even though this is still a work in progress in many respects) as it has done had the project not been facilitating the process.

Lesson 4: Donor coordination is important.

22. It also appears to be incredibly elusive. The challenge presented by land degradation in the region is much larger than the vanity of any one donor organisation. However, we see repeatedly projects designed with the intention of fixing "*the whole thing*". A typical example will include addressing the enabling environment, capacity building, demonstration projects and mainstreaming the experience in just a few years. Yet we never stop to consider that the "problem" has been many decades if not centuries in the making. To avoid any misunderstanding the MCB project was not trying to fix the whole thing, indeed it was targeting a component of a wider sub-set of issues. Projects are small-scale, time bound and the more focused they are the more likely the chance of success. The problem is large-scale, continuous and extremely complex. Building a coalition of donors and coordinating the different parts to be addressed while pooling the intellectual capacities to think about the problem is probably the only way we can achieve the sorts of economy of scale to address land degradation in its entirety. The FE believes that the MCB demonstrated this (as a "work in progress") despite the challenges it has faced.

Table summarising main ratings received

Issue	Section in report	Rating	Explanation
Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry and implementation	4.2.5	<u>Marginally Satisfactory</u>	Things were being monitored but there was little that could be done to adapt the project. The problem of five countries and a regional LFM should have been anticipated during the design phase or if not it should have been addressed more fully during the Inception Phase. BRC and the GEF should have been less intransigent and allowed the LFM to be realigned during the Inception Phase. The MTR appears to have lacked the authority to address the LFM issue and the recommendations were weak
UNDP & Implementing Partner implementation/execution, coordination and operational issues	4.2.6	<u>Marginally Satisfactory</u>	The weakness the Project Document to clearly articulate the arrangements, weaknesses in the inception phase, delays in replacing the regional Project manager, <i>etc.</i> , inability of the PSC to address the issues have brought the rating down unfortunately because, had the project continued for longer and with the appointment of a substantive regional Project manager the MCB might have put many of these problems behind it.
Overall results (attainment of objective)	4.3	<u>Satisfactory</u>	Three out of the four outcomes are satisfactory. The objective is difficult to measure using the LFM indicators. However, the FE feels that the project, despite the many challenges has made good progress and in the right direction and many of the internal challenges to the project are essentially what the outcomes were intended to address, therefore the working through of these issues within the project, even if they have not reached a clear resolution are a positive outcome. The FE realises that using the rating scale in this way is unusual and only possible because the MCB is framed within the CACILM programme and the lessons and experience generated will be incorporated into future interventions under the CACILM umbrella.
Relevance	4.3.2	<u>Highly Satisfactory</u>	The MCB was a bold and innovative project and is closely aligned with many of the reform processes taking place within the region viz a viz pasture management reform, civil society, <i>etc.</i> The high rating is possible because the project was pushing the boundaries and moving from a technical intervention to supporting a

			process of developing natural resource governance.
Effectiveness & Efficiency	4.3.3	<u>Satisfactory</u>	Overall the effectiveness outweighs the issues relating to efficiency
Effectiveness	4.3.3	<u>Satisfactory</u>	The MCB appears to have put process before project <i>expedience</i> in most of its activities and has had a capacity to analyse, learn and communicate ideas
Efficiency	4.3.3	<u>Marginally Satisfactory</u>	The project could have been executed less painfully. However, many of the difficulties faced have been largely due to the design and under-resourcing of elements of the project (e.g. regional travel for team building and strategy workshops, etc.). Decisions could have been made more expeditiously through the PSC and the issues relating to the M&E and LFM have brought this rating down
Sustainability	4.3.6	<u>Likely</u>	The outcomes from the project are useful and have been mainstreamed into the enabling environment. The job is far from over but the individuals tasked with continuing with this process are better equipped to carry it out
Financial sustainability	4.3.6	<u>Moderately Likely</u>	The IFS(s) need work but the continued support from the second generation. However, in the short to medium term the CACILM II and Flermoneca funding is likely to continue the process
Socio-political sustainability	4.3.6	<u>Likely</u>	The project has been addressing SLM through existing socio-political means
Institutional sustainability	4.3.6	<u>Likely</u>	The project has through a facilitation process transferred many of its skills and functions to existing institutional players
Environmental sustainability	4.3.6	<u>Likely</u>	It is reasonable for the FE to judge that the MCB has contributed to making land management more resilient in the region and thus, sustainable

2 Introduction

23. This report provides an account and the findings and conclusions of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the UNDP-GEF Project (PIMS 3231 SLM FSP) Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management Multi-country Capacity Building Project (CACILM MCB⁴) that has been directly implemented by United Nations Development Programme in five Central Asian countries, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.
24. The field work for the TE took place from the 27th November to the 18th December 2012 and was carried out by two independent Consultants⁵ (National and International). The evaluation process consisted of studying the project's documentation, field visits and interviews with project stakeholders and a detailed analysis of the findings. The TE took place over a period of 30 days (not including travel).
25. The preliminary findings and recommendations of the TE were presented at the Project Board Meeting held in Almaty on the 15th December 2012 and an Aide Memoire provided a written account of the evaluation immediately following the field work.

2.2 Project background

26. The project is an integrated multi-country initiative within the CACILM Country Partnership Programme (CPP) and is one of four related multi-country support projects under the CACILM Multi-country Framework Project (CMPF) by contributing the system, institutional, and individual capacities needed to respond to country barriers in terms of an inconsistent and divergent policy environment, inadequate and inefficient resources to combat SLM, gaps in human capital to develop SLM programs, and a disconnect between project level successes and policy making. The project builds upon the structure created by the CMPF and supports the CACILM CPP effort to catalyze actions to reverse land degradation processes and improve sustainable livelihoods through a consolidated approach put in place by the five Central Asian Countries and Strategic Partnership Agreement members (UNDP, ADB, GIZ, GM, ICARDA, and FAO) with Global Environment Facility (GEF) support. Building on this framework and consistent with the overall CMPF vision to enhance "the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD"⁶.

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

27. Evaluation is an integral part of the UNDP-GEF project cycle management. The TE is guided by its Terms of Reference (ToR)⁷ and UNDP-GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures⁸. The evaluation process is independent of both UNDP and GEF and the opinions and recommendations in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the GEF, UNDP, or the Regional and National Project Management Units⁹ (PMUs), however, once accepted the TE becomes a recognised component of the project's documentation.

⁴ Referred to as the MCB

⁵ A National Consultant participated in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. In Kazakhstan an interpreter was provided and the National Consultant for Kyrgyzstan participated in the telephone interviews with Turkmenistan.

⁶ Source Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

⁷ See Annex 1

⁸ <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>

⁹ The Project Document referred to these as Capacity Building Units. Their form and function is identical to a project management unit and are referred to as such throughout this report

28. This TE is initiated by the UNDP Kyrgyzstan as the Implementation Agency for this Project and it aims to provide managers (Kyrgyzstan/Ministry of Agriculture, Tajikistan/Committee for Environmental Protection¹⁰, Kazakhstan/Kazhydromet and Turkmenistan/Desert Institute under Ministry of Nature Protection, PMU, UNDP COs the Uzhydromet/Uzbekistan¹¹, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan Offices, German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ), Global Mechanism (GM) and GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's expected results and for replicating those results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.
29. Terminal Evaluations are intended to provide an objective and independent assessment of project implementation and impact, including achievement of global environmental benefits and lessons learned to guide future SLM efforts. Specifically, the FE will assess the extent to which the planned project outcomes and outputs have been achieved, as well as assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project as defined in the guidelines for Terminal Evaluations.
30. The evaluation also measures the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy. The evaluation covers the entire project including non-GEF financed components.
31. The TE addressed a number of key issues such as:
- The performance of the Project – has it done what it said it would do?
 - The effectiveness of the interventions – having done what it set out to do, has it worked?
 - The impact of the Project – what are the outcomes now, and in the future, of the Project's intervention.
32. The Evaluators initially carried out a desk-based review of the Project's documentation prior to carrying out the field trip. The field trip consisted of interviews with local participants and project partners as well as the Project staff.
33. The CACILM MCB has been a multi-country approach; that is, it has a project management unit or Capacity Building Unit¹² (CBU) present in all five countries that is coordinated by a regional (in as much as it coordinates across the five countries) project management unit or CBU based in Kyrgyzstan.
34. The TE takes the view that the project was initially designed with a single log frame matrix (LFM) and should not be evaluated as five discrete country-projects recognising that in the field of sustainable land management (SLM) in Central Asia it is necessary to take an approach that reflects the interconnectedness of the five countries. Therefore this report evaluates the MCB project "in the whole" with reference to the country issues contained in Annex 4.
35. Furthermore, the effective implementation and execution of multi-country initiatives that allow *subsidiarity*¹³ is of considerable interest to the key project partners (UNDP Country Offices, GIZ and Focal Points) in developing a post-CACILM approach to regional SLM challenges without the construct of large and regional structures and as the roles of CACILM are absorbed by state and none-state actors across the region.

¹⁰ The UNCCD Focal Point had formerly been housed within the Ministry of Agriculture. As a result the CBU in Tajikistan had very established a very good partnership with this Ministry

¹¹ The UNCCD Focal Point is housed within the Uzhydromet. As a result the CBU in Uzbekistan had very established a very good partnership with this Ministry

¹² This is the term used in the Project Document

¹³ *Subsidiarity* is the idea that a central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level or in this case, the country level.

3 The Project and Its Development Context

36. The Midterm Review (MTR) provides a very reasonable contextual description of the MCB: *A common experience of countries in Central and North Asia of the period of the command economy was one of over exploitation of natural resources in the search for increased production. This is commonly agreed to have resulted in widespread land degradation and these trends have continued in the post soviet period although with different characteristics as some land has been abandoned and maintenance of some infrastructure such as collectors has deteriorated or ceased.*
37. According to FAO estimates, over 13% of the region was degraded between 1981 and 2003 (measured as a loss of net primary productivity [NPP] adjusted for changes in climate), affecting 6% of the regional population. Negative environmental impacts have worsened, including the drying up of the Aral Sea (except in Kazakhstan, where some restoration has occurred), water and air pollution caused by salinization, water and wind erosion of soils, loss of biodiversity, and reduced provision of ecosystem services in desert, mountain, wetland and riparian ecosystems.
38. The principal land degradation problems are described in the National Programming Frameworks (NPFs)¹⁴ which evolved from the National Action Plans. The nature of these problems and their causes are numerous and complex, and vary across the region. Each country has identified capacity gaps through the National Capacity Self Assessment process. These sources identify a common low national capacity, ineffective policy environment, low levels of public investment, and the need to develop decision-making frameworks based on lessons learned from field-level projects and investments needed to develop increased national capacity to deal better with a variety of institutional, policy and other barriers to sustainable land management that limit an effective response to land degradation.
39. Subsequent actions by national governments with the support of GEF and bi-lateral and multi-lateral development cooperation organizations have led to the development of national structures in the form of National Coordination Councils and National Secretariats and frameworks, such as the National Programming Framework (NPF) as a part of the CACILM.
40. The MTE identified that: the CACILM structure had been weakened since the initiation of the MCB project principally by the withdrawal of ADB support. However the enabling decrees that established the National Coordination Councils (NCCs) have not been rescinded and work continues in many countries through ad hoc structures to undertake the previously agreed duties under CACILM.
41. The Multi-country CACILM secretariat (MSEC) still operates to some extent, particularly in the Knowledge Management and Research projects. National in kind support continues through each country and the agreed inputs by other partners, notable UNDP, GIZ and Global Mechanism (GM) has also continued and in some cases has increased to fill some of the gap created by ADB's withdrawal. This project, to a substantial extent, now provides the regional multi-country platform for CACILM that had been provided by the MSEC. The success or failure of MCB will thus have a very significant impact on the continued support of the national countries and the Strategic Partnership for UNCCD implementation in CAC (SPA), for the CACILM structure. Some SPA partners and GEF subsequently reaffirmed their support for this structure as a result of presentations by national participants as side event in a meeting in Berne (3-4 May, 2011).
42. This reduced investment and capacity has nevertheless introduced a significant new medium term risk for CACILM and was an important context for the MTE not anticipated in the Project document or in the MTE TOR.
43. As discussed in para. 16 the TE will attempt, within the confines of the ToR to examine whether this dependence upon CACILM structures is necessary or whether the intentions of CACILM have

¹⁴ National Programming Frameworks are follow-on frameworks to operationalize the UNCCD-National Action Plans. These are available from the CACILM Knowledge Network, accessible at <http://www.adb.org/projects/CACILM/19>

evolved into more robust and diffuse institutional structures (including non-state actors) and that external donor agencies need to develop a funding framework for implementing and executing SLM projects in Central Asia.

3.1 The GEF Objective (GEF Operational Programme #15)

44. The GEF OP#15, Land Degradation, which to a large extent will be the median against which the Projects performance will be judged, is defined by the document Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management (op#15) revised in 2003.
45. Within GEF OP#15 Land degradation is broadly defined as "... any form of deterioration of the natural potential of land that affects ecosystem integrity either in terms of reducing its sustainable ecological productivity or in terms of its native biological richness and maintenance of resilience."¹⁵
46. The expected outcomes of GEF-supported activities on sustainable land management include the following:
 - a) *Institutional and human resource capacity is strengthened to improve sustainable land management planning and implementation to achieve global environment benefits within the context of sustainable development.*
 - b) *The policy, regulatory and economic incentive framework is strengthened to facilitate wider adoption of sustainable land management practices across sectors as a country addresses multiple demands on land resources for economic activities, preservation of the structure and functional integrity of ecosystems, and other activities.*
 - c) *Improvement in the economic productivity of land under sustainable management and the preservation or restoration of the structure and functional integrity of ecosystems.*

3.1 Description of the Project

47. The GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM: Multi-country capacity building project was approved by GEF in 2009. The inception workshop was organized in March 2010. The project is a three-year SLM capacity building project being implemented in five Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). The project officially commenced in January 2010 and will terminate in December 2012.
48. The project is financed by the global environment facility (GEF) through its operational program for land degradation, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the GIZ GmbH, and the Global Mechanism of the UNCCD (GM). The project is directly executed (DEX) by UNDP CO in five Central Asian countries where UNDP CO Kyrgyzstan is a principal office. In GEF terminology it is a "full-size" project (FSP) i.e. it has a contribution from GEF exceeding US\$ 1 million. The total project is valued at US\$ 6,176,500 of which GEF financing is US\$ 2,865,000¹⁶ in in-kind or cash contributions.
49. The **goal** of the project is: *the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD.*
50. The project **objective** is: *to increase capacity at the national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming Framework.*
51. The project is designed to produce four outcomes:

¹⁵ GEF 1999. Report of the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Land Degradation (GEF/C.14/Inf. 15)

¹⁶ Including the PDF B (project development grant US\$ 109,398)

Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.

Outcome 1 responds to the policy gaps and to the need for mainstreaming policies on land degradation and how and what type of incentives is available for production processes, funding available for SLM, and finally, the inclusiveness of policies. Outcome 1 was designed to enhance policy coherence by providing the conditions and capacities that will enable the effective review of the policy framework and to the development of tangible recommendations for policy actions at the national and multi-country levels. It was planned that the existing CACILM structure will be the beneficiary of system-level organizational development activities that will make it a more effective and sustainable forum for bringing together diverse agencies for the purpose of guiding the NPF. The outputs to support Outcome 1 provide for an enabling multi-country agreement, an articulated methodology and tools to analyze and improve policy coherence at the national level. Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 1.1: A strengthened inter-governmental structure to support SLM

Output 1.2: Fortified CACILM national-level structures and mechanism to support policy development and mainstreaming.

Output 1.3: Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing:

Output 1.4: Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies:

Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements.

This outcome was deemed to establish an effective baseline and benchmarks for SLM financing and develop the organic capacities to mobilize resources in support of SLM. The outcome builds-off an initial introduction to the *Developing Integrated Financing Strategies Initiative* (DIFS), initiated by the Global Mechanism, and seeks to catalyze a capacity enhancement and knowledge exchange process that results in establishing a core national team comprised of relevant governmental and civil society stakeholders enabled for developing an Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS). Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 2.1 – Five national multi-stakeholder working groups are established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing [Integrated Financing Strategies] IFSs

Output 2.2 – Five Integrated Financing Strategies drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.

Output 2.3: Five SLM Investment Programs Developed:

Output 2.4: Five National Integrated Financing Strategies approved for implementation

Outcome 3: Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through human resource development.

Outcome 3 responds to the need for a collaborative approach by increasing the system, institutional and individual capacities to implement a multi-stakeholder management process within the "integrated area-based approach." This will be realized through an increase in the capacity for collaborative SLM by improving the interaction, communication, and coordination between state agencies, land users, and other principal stakeholders at the

local and national levels. This exchange will increase the local inputs into policy-making and improvements to the legal framework while lending higher visibility of the concerns of the actors at the local level. Outcome 3 emphasizes both short-term interventions in establishing the basis for collaborative resource management, through training and events while developing long-term frameworks in the form of capacity building strategies and action plans oriented to specific stakeholder groups. The specific outputs are:

Output 3.1: A national-level, long-term SLM Capacity Building Program approved by NCC.

Output 3.2: Approved Mechanisms for enhanced communication and coordination between state agencies and land users.

Output 3.3: Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.

Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened.

This outcome is designed to be fully complementary to the CACILM SLM Knowledge Network (CKN), under the auspices of the CACILM Knowledge Management Project (SLM-KM). The learning networks, events, tools, and strategies established within this outcome provide a forum for horizontal and vertical integration that enable participants to partake in blended learning and in face-to-face events at the national-level. These will complement the information presented in the multi-country web-based CACILM Knowledge Network. The national learning events will provide an opportunity to provide the CKN with enhanced levels of promotion that are essential in engaging members from an extensive base of ground-level networks capable of feeding new learning products into the CKN communication channels.

The development of learning networks on national level that connect decision-makers with the grass roots experiences in combating land degradation and that enable an effective horizontal and vertical exchange of leaning at the national-level. These networks will focus on personal and face-to-face interaction in a way that reaches the majority of the stakeholders, many of whom do not have access to computers or electronic networks.

The development of interactive learning events, products, and tools that provide for the level of interaction required for a truly interactive multi-stakeholder community. The key outputs will include:

Output 4.1: National Learning Networks on best practices in collaborative SLM established and functioning.

Output 4.2 Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders.

Output 4.3: Effective system of upscaling and replication of good practices in collaborative SLM on national and regional level established and functional.

52. The Project PDF B17 was developed between November 2007 and August 2009 resulting in the Project Document which was signed on the 10th December 2009. The Project started in January 2010 with an inception phase lasting until April 2010. The MTE was carried out in July 2011 and the scheduled closure date is December 2012 with a duration of three years following the FE held in December 2012. At the time of the FE a budget neutral extension of 2 months was being discussed for the regional component of the project in order to follow up with Final Evaluation, addressing its comments, preparation of management, responses and implementation of

¹⁷ Project Development Fund (conceptual and design period of the Project)

recommendations, translation of final version of evaluation report into Russian language and dissemination to all partners, drafting the annual report for 2012, preparation and submission of PIR, follow up of WOCAT on finalizing and printing of SLM Overview Book, preparation of all MCB publications (meta data) to be uploaded to the UCA administered online knowledge management platform, develop a license agreement between UNDP and GIZ/UCA for uploading these materials, financial closure of the project and other pending activities at regional and country levels.

53. The MCB project is specifically designed as a capacity building project and is framed within the earlier, larger, regional GEF-ADB CACILM programme which included, under the CACILM Multi-country Framework Project (CMPF) elements of research, information systems (GIS) and knowledge management. Capacity building was intended to have taken place within the lifetime of the first CACILM programme but in the event was the last component to be implemented.

3.2 Project Context

54. To understand the MCB, its design, implementation and outcomes, it is important to locate the project in both a regional development context and the earlier donor initiatives intended to address land degradation at a multi-country scale within the region. Arguably both have had a profound effect upon the project.
55. At a regional development level the project is set in the context of a socio-political, ecological and economic system that can quite reasonably be described as having undergone catastrophic change in very recent history that has been well-documented, not least in GEF project development documents. It is useful to start with the relatively recent collapse of the former Soviet Union (FSU) and independence of the Central Asian states. But it would be far too simplistic to see this withdrawal of the administrative structures, technical knowhow and finance as the reason behind the current land degradation in the area, not least because land was already being managed unsustainably during this period. Therefore, any project seeking to address land degradation issues would necessarily be facing not just a technical challenge that could be resolved by the introduction of new technologies and methodologies for land management or financing, but also an adaptive challenge, necessitating considerable effort to build the capacity for land management at the system, institutional, and individual levels and, in particular, to change the behaviour of individuals, institutions and agencies and they ways in which they interact.
56. *The project is an integrated multi-country initiative within the CACILM CPP and is one of four related multi-country support projects¹⁸ under the CACILM Multi-country Framework Project (CMPF) by contributing the system, institutional, and individual capacities needed to respond to country barriers in terms of an inconsistent and divergent policy environment, inadequate and inefficient resources to combat SLM, gaps in human capital to develop SLM programs, and a disconnect between project level successes and policy making. The project builds upon the structure created by the CMPF and supports the CACILM CPP effort to catalyze efforts to reverse land degradation processes and improve sustainable livelihoods through a consolidated approach put in place by the five Central Asian Countries and Strategic Partnership Agreement members (UNDP, ADB, GIZ, GM, ICARDA, and FAO) with Global Environment Facility (GEF) support. Building on this framework and consistent with the overall CMPF vision to enhance "the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD".¹⁹*

¹⁸ See para. 34

¹⁹ Source terms of Reference MCB FE

4 Findings and Conclusions

57. The MCB has been a troubled project. Why would we expect it to be otherwise? Unlike the other three elements (research, information systems (GIS) and knowledge management) of the CACILM the MCB was a marriage between three partners, each with different operation and procedural practices and operating at a multi-country level within a region where there is considerable uncertainty and unpredictability and importantly, unlike the first three elements of CACILM which were essentially addressing a technical challenge the MCB was addressing an adaptive challenge.

Technical challenges:

- A technical challenge is a challenge that can be addressed with existing expertise, protocols and operations.
- Implementing solutions to technical challenges often falls to someone with the authority to address them.
- Technical training (*i.e.* using a manual and new equipment) can resolve the problem.

Adaptive challenges:

- Encounter situations for which solutions lie outside the current way of operation, and possibly, thinking..
- Applying existing procedures and understanding does not provide the solution needed.
- Stakeholders must be involved in developing and implementing solutions.
- Solutions lie not in the application of expertise, but rather from a process of learning and adapting.
- Addressing adaptive challenges requires trying solutions that are new and maybe quite different.
- Inherent in addressing adaptive challenges are the need to become comfortable with not knowing what the next move might be, dealing with uncertainty.
- It is necessary to think (institutionally, individually, collectively...) what we should continue to do, what we should start to do and, critically, what we might need to stop doing...
- Addressing adaptive challenges may require the transfer of *power* (the ability to make decisions and to influence future events) from one party to another.
- Normally require *expert thinking*, which is the ability to solve non-rule-based problems.
- Addressing adaptive challenges requires solutions that are new and maybe quite different.
- Inherent in adaptive work is the need to become comfortable with not knowing what the next move might be.
- Adaptive challenges require time for adaptive solutions to have an effect and stakeholders cannot expect to react too quickly because of the discomfort that comes with not knowing.

Adapted from: Heifetz, Ronald A.; Leadership Without Easy Answers (Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1994)

58. As such it was moving from capacity building as might be defined as a technical challenge towards capacity building as an adaptive challenge. In fact the project was moving further than capacity building as simply strengthening the status quo and addressing issues of governance;

what is meant by governance in this instance is: "the means for achieving direction, control, and coordination that determines the effectiveness of management"²⁰.

59. Despite the troubles that it has faced, it is reasonable for the FE to state that the project has had a number of notable successes and made some significant progress, indeed, the project has provided some very important insight into the challenges of addressing land degradation within the region and the evaluators are pleased with the project's progress towards outcomes in the final months before closure.
60. We might go further, and state that it has clearly demonstrated some of the weaknesses inherent in GEF projects and on the whole it has attempted to address these weaknesses in a thoughtful and pragmatic way, but, as is the case with so many of these projects, time was a deciding factor and one which was largely overlooked in the project's design. In short, despite the limitations of the project's design it has still been able to achieve, albeit with the caveat that there was insufficient time available to achieve the project's objectives.

4.1 Project Formulation

61. The project formulation is assessed on at least five criteria: conceptualisation/design, country-ownership/drivenness, replication approach and other aspect such as the comparative advantage of the Implementing Agency, etc.
62. In summary the project's design was weak. By all accounts it was a prolonged and somewhat tedious process which took approximately two years. One has to question whether alarm bells should have been ringing when a three-year project requires two years to design.
63. The Project Document that emerged from this protracted design phase had a number of critical weaknesses that will be dealt with in the following sections but it is worth commenting that while it did allow for some progressive approaches to be introduced the Project Document was on the whole:
- Overly-complicated and hard to understand, although admittedly it while it does provide room for some progressive approaches, but it still fails to describe how these were to be achieved.
 - Contained a number of unstated assumptions.
 - Was based upon outdated circumstances and data.
 - The project design took so long to develop that the CACILM structures (*e.g.* the National Coordinating Councils (NCC), except in Uzbekistan) necessary for its implementation had either disappeared or were never developed.
 - Developed a three-year project to engage with a process that was going to take much longer.
 - Was over ambitious and significantly under-resourced, including the monitoring and evaluation. While it was intended as full size project (FSP) at the country-level it was effectively five small projects plus a multi-country coordination, six small projects in total.
 - The LFM developed in the Project Document was weak and ultimately was not fit for purpose.
 - Failed to describe the structures necessary to develop such a complex and multi-country project.
 - It did not negotiate the agreements necessary to develop a complex project in an unpredictable situation.

²⁰ Eagles, Paul F J, 2008, Governance models for parks, recreation, and tourism. In: Transforming Parks and Protected area: policy and governance in a changing world. *Eds.* Kevin S. Hanna, Douglas A. Clark, and D. Scott Slocombe.

64. While all of these issues might be very damning²¹ the FE considers that the design of this project should be set in the context of the early phases of CACILM, a measure that is clear when we consider that the other three elements *were* implemented on time. Unlike the other three elements of the CACILM programme *capacity building* had a political element to it which required admission of shortcomings by individuals and institutions that were not just financial or technical in nature and in some cases might be a euphemism²² for reform.

4.1.1 Conceptualisation/Design

65. It is not clear why the project design phase was so protracted, however the FE surmises that this was due to the complex business of bringing three significant project partners and five countries together. It would also be reasonable to assume that there were numerous compromises made in order to bring all of these parties "*to the table*" within the one project and it is not unreasonable to expect that there was considerable "*fatigue*" towards the end of the design phase. Another aspect of this protracted design phase appears to have resulted in the project spanning a period in which there was considerable change taking place. The first CACILM programme was ending and differences between the five countries, their "position" in the reform process, a gradual evolution (the FE prefers to describe these changes as an evolutionary process rather than a degradation) of the earlier CACILM developments²³.

66. It is also worth noting that what has been possible during and particularly at the end of the project might not necessarily have been possible when this project was first conceptualized, at least five years ago. Indeed, "*capacity building*" may have been a euphemism for suite of reforms necessary to improve natural resources governance and thus make land management more sustainable.

67. However, it remains that the project was poorly designed on a number of levels, possibly by trying to be too ambitious and meet the expectations of all parties. In particular:

- It should have more clearly identified the importance of the project's internal governance. As the project was very clearly "navigating uncharted waters" (both as a multi-country project and by engaging with reform of governance structures and the enabling environment) the decision-making process within the project was going to need to be very clearly articulated and highly dynamic. The executive lay with the Project Board (PB) but this only met twice during the project's lifetime²⁴. The Project Document should have provided terms of reference and rules²⁵ for the PB. The value of the project partners participating in such a process in building an understanding of how government can work and how to conduct the meetings should not be underestimated as a valuable outcome of the project in its self.
- The importance of the regional coordination was underestimated. Indeed there was always a high risk that the country-level CBUs could drift off and simply become grant dispersal mechanisms distributing the GEF fund. In the event this has not happened, but the under-resourcing of the regional/multi-country CBU has made this difficult to say the least.
- There was an unstated assumption that the five countries and the regional coordination would have the requisite skills and tools necessary to proceed with the capacity building (e.g. team building, reporting, and facilitation). Essentially the teams had capable individuals but they required training and direction to carry out a project that was very

²¹ Strongly suggesting guilt or error (of a circumstance or piece of evidence)

²² The act or an example of substituting a mild, indirect, or vague term for one considered harsh, blunt, or offensive

²³ Perhaps the most significant being the withdrawal of ADB support which resulted in the NCCs not materialising (except in Uzbekistan)

²⁴ The second time being during the FE at the close of the project

²⁵ These rules could have been easily adapted from general rules about board meetings lifted from the internet

different from any thus far experienced in the region. It would take time to build these capabilities within the project team (the five country CBUs) and to build the team structure itself. One is hesitant to draw lessons from the corporate world because it may require different value systems, but parallels can be drawn on the investment that successful companies make in team building and developing common visions and values.

- It underestimated the importance of technical assistance (TA) in what it was trying to achieve particularly the level at which TA would need to be provided. Thus it began with TA playing a very strategic role and only later was TA embedded at the CBU-level and country-levels.
- Monitoring and evaluation was under-resourced in the project design. It should have been recognised that this was going to be a complex and unpredictable project and the monitoring and evaluation should have been used more strategically (as opposed to an audit function) to enhance the adaptive management of the project. In the event there was a budget which allowed just 60 days for MTR and FE. Given that there were five countries plus the regional coordination this hardly allowed the type of in depth scrutiny and analysis necessary. One need not demonstrate the maths at this junction, merely to point out that spending time with six different CBUs plus logistics leaves little time for analysis. To make matters worse the monitoring and evaluation is included in the project management budget line, on which there is a ceiling of 10% of total GEF project costs leaving managers with a difficult decision between costs of the monitoring and management aspects of their work.
- The Integrated Financial Strategies (IFS) may not have been readily transferable for the simple reason that the templates used emanated from systems that had a wholly different operating system and historical approaches to financial planning and management²⁶.

68. The FE considers that, while the CACILM framework had considerable experience, there was very little that could be brought to bear on a project of this nature because much of what had gone before was essentially technical, whereas the MCB was a novel approach in many ways, in particular it was process oriented.

4.1.2 Results framework, risks and assumptions

69. The LFM that emerges from the project design phase is reasonable, albeit ambitious, to the level of the objective and outcomes. However, it did not develop the LFM *outputs* with indicators²⁷. Presumably leaving these to the project to develop during the Inception Phase. There appears to have been an assumption, but it was certainly not one that was clearly articulated, that was made regarding the LFM; which was that one size would fit all five countries. This might suggest a contradiction with other statements made in the Project Document and repeated in the following section. Similarly, many of the structures that were part and parcel of the LFM (*e.g. the* NSECs and NCCs) were not developed or had been replaced by other institutional structures.

70. In the event, the five countries developed their own "*informal*"²⁸ LFMs. The difficulty of operating a project with six LFMs, using the normal GEF monitoring and evaluation criteria should not be understated. In this instance, the project appears to have tried hard but in all of this process the *outcome indicators* were lost and replaced by *output indicators*. It is not hard to imagine that this could have been disastrous and should have been foreseen during the project's design phase. In any event it has used up much of what is a project's most precious commodity, *time* and makes it hard if not impossible to judge the efficacy of the outputs contribution to creating the outcomes. The issue of the informal LFMs was in this case acceptable because each

²⁶ The weaknesses in the IFS are dealt with in greater detail in section 4.1.5, para. 67

²⁷ The outputs are contained within the narrative of the Project Document. P. 28 - 48

²⁸ This term was used repeatedly by project staff during the FE.

country CBU appears to have been acting responsibly and there was considerable intellectual capacity within the country teams. However, as a solution this cannot be recommended in the future. The risks of developing alternative LFM could easily lead to "mission creep" within the project, considerable time spent negotiating with individual countries and the inclusion of outputs (and expenditure of resources) on items that are not within the sphere of GEF OP15 spending²⁹. On this basis the country, or "informal" LFM have been included as annexes (Annex 4) to provide a demonstration of the project's impact, however, the project *per se* is rated on the original Project Document LFM following the agreed changes made during the Inception Phase.

71. Therefore, LFM that was developed was confusing, the project CBU team members found it confusing, it would appear that the MTR was unimpressed with it; and the FE has to admit to finding it unhelpful. In many instances despite stating that *"the project will produce results that require process indicators to adequately gauge progress towards the achievement of the outcomes"*³⁰. In the event most of the indicators that were developed owed less to process and appeared more to be the restated targets.
72. The attempts by the project to revise the LFM appear to have been restricted by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination, Bratislava and possibly by the GEF Secretariat itself. It would appear to the FE that at both levels the contractual function of the LFM was being applied over the, quite reasonable applied in this case, adaptive management function. The revised LFM was subsequently approved but lacked outcome indicators.
73. During the FE the issue of the NCCs was raised repeatedly and should therefore be mentioned here. Perhaps it is an indication of just how difficult it is to develop these complex projects. In the Project Document risk matrix this was given a low risk rating, stating: *"There is no demonstrated concern over significant withdrawals from in NCC membership"*³¹. We might reasonably ask; *how did they get it so wrong?* However, it also identified: *"All countries are willing to continue to work jointly within the CACILM structure"*³². In the event it was not actually the participating countries that withdrew but a breakup of the donor coalition with the withdrawal of the ADB which resulted in the realisation of a low risk regarding the NCCs.
74. Lastly it is important to note that the LFM relied heavily upon the development of the adapted scorecard as a proxy indicator or index of change. As index this might have provided a reasonable measure of process, however, in the event this was not developed until June 2011 and was only measured through an internal (although very honest) appraisal in July 2011. Therefore it does not provide a start-of-project baseline and provides only one data point (effectively a baseline mid project).

4.1.3 Country ownership/Drivenness

75. The Project Document made the case: *"Country Drivenness by the CAC's in support for the Multi-country Capacity Building Project has been demonstrated at numerous junctures since the signing and ratification of the NAPs Parallel to that process, the CACs have subscribed in 2003 to the Sub-regional Action Programme for Central Asian Countries on Combating Desertification and Drought (SRAP-CD) demonstrating their willingness to support a multi-country approach to land degradation problems. The CACs have adopted National Environmental Action Plans and Regional Environmental Action Plans that promote national capacities towards integrated ecosystem management and building regional cooperation and capacity. The NAPs clearly outline the need for capacity development in response to land degradation problems. The NPFs, which were developed through multi-stakeholder working groups, UNCCD focal points, and*

²⁹ For the avoidance of doubt this did not happen in the case of the MCB

³⁰ Project Document P. 43, para. 155

³¹ Project Document Risk Matrix p. 47

³² *Ibid*

international partners, also outline the need to take actions in the areas of (a) policy and policy coordination; (b) mainstreaming of policies; (c) institutional strengthening; (d) increased budgetary support; and (e) increased technical and managerial capacity. Providing multi-country actions to support the implementation of the NPFs is the core of the CACILM Multi-country Framework Project (CMPF) of which this project is an integrated initiative. It outlines the underpinnings for the MCB Project. Support for the CMPF was generated through a participative and country-driven process working group meetings and participative actions at the country level and was endorsed by UNCCD and GEF focal points and is under execution³³". With which the FE broadly agrees: that there was considerable ownership of this project at the national level and it is apparent that whatever happened during the project's design and the subsequent project implementation, the MCB has facilitated a degree of critical self-analysis amongst the participants resulting in considerable honesty in the participant's appraisal and understanding of where the gaps might be.

76. However, the Project Document then goes on to state that: *"In all stages, the active involvement of the NCCs has been planned, allowing those national steering bodies an ample role in the deliberation and approval of all project activities and products. This role, including coordination by NSECs, will assure the project actions are driven by the country in an adaptive management process. To assure further country inputs, the participation of a very agile and active multi-country steering committee is proposed"*³⁴. In the event these structures didn't materialise, which in its self was not a problem as it would appear that in many instances these countries had dispersed the functions within their existing state structures, perhaps a political *"coming of age"* that was taking place, which marked a progression? However, from a project perspective it appears to have resulted in considerable confusion because these terms were locked into the LFM.
77. Regardless of these shortcomings the project appears to have been highly valued by national agencies, institutions, and interestingly, many of the individuals spoke with genuine appreciation, indeed affection, for the project. The FE surmises that this might be a comparative advantage of UNDP implementation because the COs are regarded differently to other donor agencies³⁵.

4.1.4 Stakeholder participation

78. A fairly substantial and reasonable stakeholder matrix was developed in the Project Document³⁶ the most important aspect being that it relied heavily upon the *"existing CACILM structure"* (e.g. the CACILM Steering Committee (CSC), NCCs and MSEC) which in the event did not survive to the project's inception and it is hard to see where this emergent weakness was adequately addressed in the Inception Phase. The second point of interest is the *"international partners"*. In reality the main partner's participation was through the Project Board, or MCB Project Steering Committee (PSC) as a means to provide their robust and effective participation in the project. However, like most steering committees. However, the PSC only met twice in May 2011 and December 2012.
79. However, on the whole the FE feels that there was a healthy and robust participation in the project. Admittedly this might not always have felt this way to those involved in the project but this has to be set in the context of the complexity of implementing and executing a project such as the MCB. Had the project had more time these issues might have been ironed out providing more effective and possibly less fraught, participation.

³³ Project Document, P.50, para. 170

³⁴ Project Document, para. 171, p. 51

³⁵ This will be explored in more detail in section 4.1.6

³⁶ Project Document p. 96 - 99

80. Of particular note was the manner in which the project (at the country level) appears to have been able to work with stakeholders at all levels (e.g. at the political/policy, technocratic, administrative, community and individual levels). It is this vertical participation that is partly the basis for the FEs comments regarding the evolution of this project from capacity building into natural resource governance.
81. Lastly it is important to note that the CBU(s) are also stakeholders in this process. Section 4.1.1, para. 48, has already discussed the weakness caused by the assumption that project staff would have the requisite skills for a project such as this. It is important also to consider that the team building exercises instigated by the CTA were critical in building a multi-country network which has greatly facilitated the transfer of ideas and experience. This team building and subsequent networking should have been foreseen in the project's design, or if it was (which is not immediately clear) then it should also have been budgeted for.

4.1.5 Catalytic role and replication approach

82. GEF guidelines describe this variously as:

"The catalytic role of GEF-funded interventions is embodied in their approach of supporting the creation of an enabling environment and of investing in pilot activities which are innovative and showing how new approaches can work.

The evaluation will assess the catalytic role played by [this] project, namely to what extent the project has:

- (a) catalyzed behavioural changes in terms of use and application by the relevant stakeholders of: i) technologies and approaches show-cased by the demonstration projects; ii) strategic programmes and plans developed; and iii) assessment, monitoring and management systems established at a national and sub-regional level;*
- (b) provided incentives (social, economic, market based, competencies etc.) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholder behaviour;*
- (c) contributed to institutional changes. An important aspect of the catalytic role of the project is its contribution to institutional uptake or mainstreaming of project-piloted approaches in the regional and national demonstration projects;*
- (d) contributed to policy changes (on paper and in implementation of policy);*
- (e) contributed to sustained follow-on financing (catalytic financing) from Governments, the GEF or other donors;*
- (f) created opportunities for particular individuals or institutions ("champions") to catalyze change (without which the project would not have achieved all of its results).*

Replication, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated (experiences are repeated and lessons applied in different geographic areas) or scaled up (experiences are repeated and lessons applied in the same geographic area but on a much larger scale and funded by other sources)."

83. The MCB was intended as a catalytic project. In this sense the FE can state that it has been remarkably successful. By way of illustration; the MCB was not necessarily intended to demonstrate "best practices", indeed it did not generate any examples of "best practices" in the strictest sense. However, it did enable other projects to articulate their own "best practices" and to disseminate those using various media and forums such as the WOCAT website³⁷.

³⁷ <https://www.wocat.net/>

84. The FE will not exhaustively list the examples where the project has provided a catalyst for change or has met the criteria for replication. These can be found in the regional and country LFM (see Annex 4). However, it is important to state that if replication is expected from projects then there should be sufficient time for this to take place. There is an assumption that the project will "*see the truth at once and make towards it*"³⁸ when this is quite clearly not the case. The very fact that there are significant national differences across the region in terms of governance, freedom of expression, civil society participation, etc., mean that this is unrealistic, particularly so with multi-country, process oriented project.
85. An example of this has been the development of the pasture laws in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan and, at a very early stage, in Turkmenistan. While the MCB was not directly responsible for the development of the Kyrgyz Law on Pastures it has facilitated a process of revision, expanded the list of involved stakeholders and included SLM in a range of strategic normative documents³⁹ that is aligned to a broader reform process taking place within the country. It would appear that this has catalysed other countries to look at their pastures with a view to reforming their management, the MCB playing a pivotal role in this process. An important aspect of this has been the use of the parliamentary system, in effect the project has been, to varying degrees across the region, making government work and doing so with an SLM objective. This is an important point because it will form the basis of the FE's conclusion that the project has been a success despite the obvious internal difficulties and the shortcomings of the LFM and indicators.
86. The IFS(s) have been less successful. It has proved difficult to integrate them into the National Programme Frameworks (NPFs) and the National Action Plans (NAPs). It would appear that the TA responsible for this was aware of these shortcomings following a monitoring and evaluation mission, but this took place in November 2012 by which time it was too late. These shortcomings included:
- The methodology for development of country based IFS were not appropriate.
 - There may not have been an adequate process for incorporating the IFS, although the project has in some ways provided some of this.
 - The IFS list of content was not aligned with the specificities of the national legal and strategic documents.
 - While the IFS(s) provide useful information on availability of resources it provides only a few action plans.
 - The IFS(s) may have been appropriate in other regions but Central Asia has emerged from a recent history where there was little in the way of financial planning due to the centralised and controlled economy.
 - A mechanism to incorporate the IFS into UNCCD NAP or any other national strategic documents not clear or no such mechanisms exists.
 - There was only a five-day workshop per country to which the GM provided TA (between October 2010 and January 2011. Subsequently the IFS working team in each of the countries met only once in June 2012.
 - The representative of GM provided technical support once during national IFS inception workshops.
87. As a result the IFS(s) are not yet approved at the national levels or they cannot be approved or recognized with the present form and draft as a strategy to be implemented by Government(s). However, on the recommendation of the RPMU the IFS teams looked for alternative relevant

³⁸ John Henry Newman 1801-1890

³⁹ Mainstreaming in "GEF speak"

government-owned strategies and to try to integrate the IFS into these. As a result, the IFS were accepted by different ministries and agencies and some parts of it are mainstreamed into national strategic papers (e.g. Green Development in Kyrgyzstan, the agrarian reform in Tajikistan, etc.).

4.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

88. For many of those involved in the project it may have been hard to see where the UNDP comparative advantage lay. There have been many a mention of the slow bureaucratic procedures. Furthermore, it has been pointed out on more than one occasion that UNDP has decentralised to the level of the Country Office (CO) to such an extent that it poses specific constraints on implementing a multi-country project. The FE acknowledges these criticisms and agrees that more could, or should, have been done to improve the speed at which the administration took place.
89. However, it is important to recognise that UNDP also has considerable advantage in implementing a project such as the MCB. Firstly it has considerable material and logistic resources (including systems and procedures) across the region, secondly, because of the COs UNDP is often regarded differently from other agencies in as much as there is an element of national ownership of the CO. Subjectively the UNDP CO is often regarded separately from other agencies that might be perceived to be representing a foreign donor. Thirdly, governance is at the core of the country programmes, although it is surprising that more is not made by CO(s) in linking environmental projects with other programmes.

4.1.6 Linkages between other projects and interventions within the sector

90. Section 4.1.5 has to some extent addressed this issue. The MCB project had considerable linkages with other projects and other donor initiatives addressing SLM within the region. Surprisingly the FE found no tangible linkages with another GEF OP15 project, the "Sustainable Land Management in the High Pamir and Pamir-Alai Mountains an Integrated Trans-boundary Initiative in Central Asia" GEF Project ID 2377" which was Implemented by the United Nations Environmental Programme in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. The FE is not able to ascertain why there appears to have been little collaboration between these two projects however, the FE feels that the reasons did not lie in the MCB project.
91. Of particular interest to the development of future projects is the way in which the MCB has provided "services" to other projects and initiatives on an *ad hoc* basis. It is important to recognise that this needed close coordination if it was not to degenerate into a small grant dispersal over the life of the project at risk of capture for objectives unrelated to GEF OP15. The FE attributes this success to the two key partners (UNDP and GIZ), the embedded TA and finally when the second RCBU Manager being appointed. The key point being that this project needed the regional coordination and the embedded TA.

4.1.6 Management arrangements

92. An elaborate set of management arrangements were laid out in the Project Document⁴⁰ which runs for some six pages. The FE surmises that it might have taken the length of the inception phase to decipher these arrangements and it is charitable to say that they are hard to understand. Certainly it is not worth repeating them here. It is difficult to judge whether these arrangements were just too complicated because, the absence of the NCC(s) in four of the countries removed a key component and presumably the role of approving annual work plans (AWPs) and making other strategic national decisions was taken up by the individual Country

⁴⁰ Project Document, Part III, p. 54-60

Offices⁴¹. Once again it is hard to determine, whether this might not have occurred if there had been a substantive regional Project Manager and an effective PSC (or Project Board) in place⁴². The FE feels that when a substantive Project Manager was put in place many of the tensions and contradictions within the project's management began to ease, albeit with very little time left for the project to run.

93. Effectively this was a Direct Implementation (DIM) project through the UNDP CO in all five CA countries and principal office in Kyrgyzstan. However, it was more complicated because execution in each of the five countries (including Kyrgyzstan) was through the CBU (in other words project management units) which were dependent upon the individual CO.
94. The Management Arrangements set out in the Project Document are complicated to the extent that when one link in the chain broke, it seems that it was not possible to clearly identify the ramifications of this and thus fix it. Furthermore, it was insufficient to describe the PSC as an *"agile and active advisory board"* without providing clear instructions as to how it was going to operate. That is; not just the *"what it should do"* but also the *"how it should do it"*. There is a counter argument that the *"how"* is best left to the Inception Phase and the FE would have some sympathy with this view except that in the evaluators experience inception phases in GEF projects are largely a confirmation of the Project Document and largely ineffective in terms of adaptive project management. Besides, the rules of the PSC should have been agreed to before embarking on the project.
95. It would be too simplistic to state that the UNDP CO(s) should not have been making decisions about what went into AWP's because without an *"agile and active advisory board that [would] steer the Multi-country Capacity Building Unit (Project Implementation Unit)"*⁴³ it is not unreasonable to suppose that the CO(s) would take on that role.
96. It is important not to gloss over these difficulties because they are the sorts of challenges that are faced by any complex project. At the risk of appearing to repeat itself, the FE stresses that this was a very complex (and important) project. It had all the hallmarks⁴⁴ of being a disaster. Yet it was not. Things were going wrong, but the project did not collapse, admittedly some of these things might have been avoided, but in the experience of the evaluators there is little evidence that other GEF projects perform much better with much more simpler projects

4.2 Project Implementation

97. It is reasonable for the FE to conclude that this has been a troubled project. Why should we expect it to be otherwise? It was a marriage between three partners, each with different operation and procedural practices and operating at a multi-country level within a region in transition between two very different forms of political, social and economic organisation, where there is considerable uncertainty and unpredictability. However, the FE is confident that the project has:

- Considerable intellectual capacity
- A strong network and collaboration across the five countries
- Very good TA (which has, subsequent to the Inception Phase, been deployed sensibly and effectively)
- At times has shown considerable leadership
- A capacity to learn and to solve complex non-rule based problems
- Been clearly valued by stakeholders

⁴¹ Except in the case of Uzbekistan

⁴² There are no terms of reference or any kind of rules for the PSC or Project Board to outline concretely membership and responsibilities of the board. Indeed the very fact that the name is interchangeable is a cause for concern

⁴³ Project Document, p. 54, para. 186

⁴⁴ The term *"hallmark"* comes from the metal industry but can be used to refer to any distinguishing characteristic or trait

- Has demonstrated good facilitation of a process
 - Allowed countries to move at their own speed but also by learning across the region
98. While the relationship between the two principal partners (UNDP and GIZ) has not always been an easy one the FE considers that this was always going to be a challenging relationship and in the final analysis both partners have made some mistakes which have put the relationship under stress more than once in the lifetime of the project. However, the FE also recognises that both parties have worked at the relationship and considers this was part of the project; as a result any mistakes that have occurred within the project have been in good faith. Because of this, and often due to the perseverance and hard work of individuals within the project, we are better able to understand the nature of the challenges to SLM in the region, what is needed to meet these challenges in the future and to have made good progress towards achieving the outcomes.

4.2.1 Adaptive management

99. At the level of the CBU there was considerable initiative and adaptation taking place. Apparently three attempts were made to revise and realign the LFM, with the realisation that the CTA needed to be embedded within the regional CBU and substantive TA was assigned at the appropriate level. Indeed within the project as a whole there was considerable adaptation or at least responding to changes in circumstances. For instance the UNDP Environmental Programme Coordinator stepping in during the absence any regional Project Manager, the dispersal of NCC functions within existing administrative and institutional structures, particularly in Kyrgyzstan, and to an extent in Tajikistan and Kazakhstan, the use of parliamentary process to drive reforms, all of these suggest that internally the project was highly versatile and adaptive. It is important also to separate this from other operational issues such as the delays in replacing the regional Project Manager and bureaucratic process that at times appears to have often been very slow⁴⁵.
100. An important aspect of this versatility, and of likely interest to future capacity building/governance support projects, is the way in which the national CBUs have selected where they put their efforts and support (both material and technical). The FE has already mentioned that there was considerable risk of the MCB becoming simply a vehicle for dispersing the GEF grant and thus liable to "*mission creep*" and/or capture by specific interests for agendas not related to OP15. However, this appears not to have happened probably as a result of the national CBUs themselves (there is no replacement for good human resources and the professionalism of the embedded TA. Certainly this would have been reinforced by the presence of a capable regional Project Manager (as was demonstrated in the closing stages of the project).
101. However, what is most confusing is what was happening regarding the LFM, and to understand this we must look at the regional level and higher and we must examine the project cycle. In a GEF project there are a number of critical phases in the project's cycle where adaptive management can have the greatest effect making a poorly designed project better or improving an already well-designed project⁴⁶. In a GEF project these are: the GEF Scientific and Technical Panel (STAP) review, the inception Phase and the MTR. The Final Evaluation is much less important because by this time it is generally too late. Importantly, to ensure that the project's management is adaptive this process requires close collaboration between PMU, Implementing and Executing Agency and critically, the UNDP-GEF regional Coordination and the GEF itself. All of these players require the confidence to make rational changes to a project in light of experience and changing circumstances otherwise the roles become essentially administrative which lends little to adaptive management.

STAP review: This offers an external assessment of a project's design. In many instances it is the first opportunity for external review following the often febrile process of developing a

⁴⁵ These are addressed in section XXX

⁴⁶ In the experience of the evaluator GEF projects are rarely unjustified but very often poorly designed

Project Document in which it is understandably easy for those involved to regard the Project Document as an end in its self and not a means to an end⁴⁷.

Inception phase: Rarely do the GEF inception phases critically challenge the Project Document, indeed they very often simply reaffirm the document and start the project. However the inception phase is the first opportunity to take stock of the realities on the ground, assess the plan against those realities and the likelihood of the near to long term future of achieving the project's stated outcomes and if necessary make significant changes to the projects design (including the LFM; indicators, activities, outputs and even outcomes⁴⁸) if a reasonable case can be made for these. Clearly these decisions have to be made at the appropriate level and they need to be made quickly. Apart from this there are also the administrative aspects of setting up a project and understandably there is a tendency to focus upon these rather than the strategic planning issues.

Mid-term review: The MTR is an integral component of the project cycle management (unlike the FE). Apart from the purely audit function (*i.e.* is the project doing what it said it would) it should also challenge the efficiency of the Project Document and LFM and if necessary it can propose changes to realign the project with its objectives. Indeed it would be justifiable for project management to "call in" a MTR early (as part of its adaptive management) if a project is not performing well or there are serious contradictions identified between the outputs, outcomes and objective.

102. With all of these "tools" there is an element of time which is just not sufficient in a three-year project if there is the slightest complexity involved. However, in most GEF projects (including the MCB) the inception phase is poorly understood and essentially served an administrative function. While the CBUs were asking for the LFM to be realigned there was considerable resistance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Centre in Bratislava (BRC) which blocked all but the most cosmetic changes to the LFM. Whether the GEF Secretariat was also resisting any change is not clear, although the FE was informed that the GEF had stated that if outputs and outcomes needed to be changed then the project might be cancelled. Such reasoning mitigates against adaptive management, which is rooted upon the premise that planning is based on numerous assumptions about how a system is operating and will respond to an intervention and that these assumptions do not always hold true, particularly with changes in circumstances. As was discussed in section 4.1.2, para. 53, the contractual function of the LFM appears to have overridden the planning and adaptive management function creating something of a dilemma for the evaluation because within the project management appears very adaptive but is constrained by the inflexibility of the LFM which has a number of shortcomings.

103. Even with its weaknesses the Inception Phase was picking up on this:

*"The project preparation process has taken place from May, 2008 till February, 2009 and actual Full-size project was approved by GEF in June 2009. Almost 13 months have passed between development of the project proposal and its actual approval and 19 months have passed between development of the project proposal and start-up of its implementation. Therefore additional review of the baseline information was necessary."*⁴⁹

104. With the best will in the world it should have been recognised that, while the problem (a lack of capacity to manage land sustainably) had not gone away, the circumstances within which the project had been designed had fundamentally changed⁵⁰.

⁴⁷ The FE has not seen a STAP review for the MCB. It was not attached to the Project Document

⁴⁸ One might presume that if the objective was found to be invalid then there would be sufficient reason for stopping the project

⁴⁹ MCB Inception report, Part IV, p. 12 (pages are not numbered in the report)

⁵⁰ In the experience of the lead evaluator this is not uncommon with GEF projects

105. By all accounts the shortcomings of the LFM were recognised by those working within the project and minor changes were made mostly to the wording of the indicators. From the FE's perspective there is a contradiction, and somewhat pedantic, in not allowing changes to be made to the projects LFM but agreeing that the individual countries could develop their own LFMs.
106. Once again, it is hard for the FE to judge just what an impact this has had on the project's final outcomes because of the difficulties in attributing *cause and effect*. In this case the causal relationships are complicated by the absence of a dedicated and substantive regional Project Manager for much of the project's initial lifetime and the shortcomings in the PSC or Project Board.

4.2.2 Partnership arrangements

107. The partnerships arrangements described in the Project Document were heavily dependent upon the CACILM structures being in place. Given that nineteen months had passed between the development of the project proposal and the project start up it may seem unfair to criticise the Project Document because the CACILM framework was no longer in place to coordinate these arrangements. However, it should still have been possible to govern the project through the PSC. The role of the PSC is to provide the executive for the project (as well as guidance); it should have governed the project and served as its accountable body, ensuring that there was a clear vision, mission, values, and policies; and that they are properly respected. Had the PSC had very clear ToR and rules governing meetings it is may have been possible to avoid many of the problems that have beset the project. However, these were not provided in the Project Document and as so often appear to be the case, it is generally too late to establish this after the project has started.
108. Furthermore, the ToR for the National Coordinators were developed with them acting as Technical Advisers rather than Project Managers. In the event their roles emerged as project managers developing the country LFMs and AWP. It is reasonable to expect this difference between a technical expert and project manager should have been anticipated in the project's design.
109. In each country good partnership relations were established with the agency that held the UNCCD Focal Point (Kyrgyzstan/Ministry of Agriculture, Tajikistan/Committee for Environmental Protection⁵¹, Kazakhstan/Kazhydromet and Turkmenistan/ Desert Institute under Ministry of Nature Protection).
110. Uzbekistan was the only country to retain an NCC which was embedded in the Uzhydromet which also held the position of UNCCD Focal Point.
111. Regardless of these shortcomings, the project established considerable partnership arrangements, particularly with the UNCCD focal Points at the country level and facilitated these relationships to a regional level through study tours, networking and other forums. Whether by luck or design it would appear that the candidates selected for the national CBUs had very good interpersonal and facilitation skills to start with. It is also highly likely that the team building exercises carried out by the CTA had a very beneficial effect on the personal development of the national CBUs once again underpinning the value of good, embedded TA and investing in personal development of project staff.
112. The project appears to have considerable credibility with and, importantly, the trust of, stakeholders. This is particularly remarkable because it is operating at many different levels (*e.g.* political, technical, local government and administration, community). While this is partly down to the UNDP comparative advantage, the CBUs have also worked hard at this and this has been facilitated by the mentoring process of the CTA and TAs. More recently, the arrival of an

⁵¹ The UNCCD Focal Point had formerly been housed within the Ministry of Agriculture. As a result the CBU in Tajikistan had very established a very good partnership with this Ministry

experienced regional Project Manager has also fostered a feeling that, despite the internal problems experienced; this is a project that *seems to know what it is doing*.

4.2.3 Feedback from monitoring and evaluation used for adaptive management

113. The adaptive management of the project has largely been dealt with in section 4.2.1. It is evident that the project was diligently carrying out monitoring and evaluation (see Table 3) and that this was to a large extent feeding back into the project management. However, it is the timidity of the responses that the FE is questioning. By way of example: The PIMS reported that:

*"Changes in CACILM governance structures resulted in the need for adjustment of the Project Objective. Project Objective is: Increase capacity at the national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming Framework. After discussion at the First Project Board Meeting in May 2011 the project Objective was footnoted 1: National Programming Framework or other national strategic documents in support in the implementation of the UNCCD."*⁵²

114. The FE has to ask the question that if the wording of the LFM becomes such an immovable issue that it begins to need footnotes, then there is a clear case for change, while the monitoring procedures are taking place they were almost certainly limiting the effectiveness of the project.
115. An important aspect of this is that it is clear to the FE that UNDP and GIZ were working closely even when the relationship was uncomfortable to make the project more dynamic and adaptive. However, in the absence of an effective vehicle for project governance, the PSC or Project Board, these decisions had a limited impact upon the project. The FE considers that both UNDP and GIZ were aware of this, indeed it was clearly articulated at the last PSC meeting held in December 2012 by the GIZ and is restated here as an *aide memoir for any future project design*.
116. Lastly, the FE cannot leave this issue without mentioning the scorecard (see section 4.1.2, para. 55). The development of the scorecard was fundamental to developing the baseline for the project and subsequent progress towards the objective. It was only developed in June 2011 by the CTA and distributed to the countries in July 2012. Therefore only one measurement exists, approximately mid project. It is likely that a scorecard measured over three years would detect some change, but given that most three-year GEF projects spends⁵³ roughly a year sorting out the problems within the project design and will likely lose a further six months over the MTR and then six more months worrying about the FE and closing the project it is remarkable that anything is ever achieved in the six months that the project really operates at full capacity. The point being that with such a short time frame to achieve such high expectations the FE is not surprised about the scorecard, it appears to be a very good scorecard but three years seems to be a wholly arbitrary time period for implementation.

4.2.4 Financial Planning

117. The planned budget (from the Inception Report) versus actual is presented in Table 1 and co-financing is presented in Table 2. The FE has no particular issues concerning financial management. There appears to have been an under-spend in outcome 3 and this might be attributable to the difficulties in "stepping down" to the community level and it appears that GIZ also covered a number of costs in this outcome⁵⁴. A measure of how important this project was can be gained when one considers that this type of activity (under outcome 3) was largely

⁵² PIMS 3790_UNDP_GEF_ST_2012_VO8_LD_final.xls

⁵³ The FE uses the word "spends" rather than "wastes"

⁵⁴ CTA pers. comm.

unknown in the region until now, indeed it appears that finding experienced people in Uzbekistan may also have contributed to the outcome's under-spending because a training of trainers exercise was unable to go ahead due to the lack of experienced personnel. As has been discussed at length in the evaluation, given more time this outcome would probably have progressed further.

118. Section 4.1, para. 44, has already noted that the project was, despite being a full-sized project, under-resourced. In effect it was six small projects (in terms of funding per country). It must be said that the original project design cannot have really envisaged the need for team building, networking and the necessary multi-country coordination and the travel that this would involve. Budget note 4 states that: Travel: *"This is multi-national and highly participative project. Travel includes regional airfares between countries is necessary to implement a multi-country workshop on assessing the enabling environment. Also, regional airfares are needed to connect the regional capacity building specialist with the CBUs"*⁵⁵. This is mirrored in the budgeting for monitoring and evaluation, not only was there only sufficient for thirty days for each (MTR and FE) but this is also included in the budget line for management which has a ceiling of 10% of project costs.
119. The figures for co-financing are an assessment at July 2012 which may account for the deficit in a number of co-financing promises from a number of countries and therefore the FE has no real concern about the shortfalls in specific co-financing commitments, particularly as there were considerable leveraged funds in Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and through the GIZ. One reason for the shortfall in UNDP CO(s) may have been result of savings due to centralising support facilities in the interests of efficiency.
120. The MTE noted that there had been bureaucratic delays on the part of UNDP, particularly related to procurement due to inflexibility and possible conflicts of interest between *"for example several accounts of requests for travel not contemplated under the AWP or logframe, but which are related to the needs of other UNDP projects in related areas"*⁵⁶. The FE feels that these are unacceptable, albeit in relation to the bureaucratic delays not unusual an unusual occurrence in any UNDP-GEF project. It is reasonable to speculate that this might not have been an issue had there been a substantive regional Project Manager in place throughout the project. For the avoidance of doubt the FE was made aware of these issues but as far as it could ascertain they were with reference to events prior to the MTR.
121. The co-financing has largely been delivered. While not all co-financiers have reached their stated targets the project has leveraged substantial additional funds.

⁵⁵ Project Document p. 84

⁵⁶ MCB MTR p. 29

Table 1 Planned versus actual spending (GEF budget)

				Original budget from Inception Report				Expenditures			
GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Total (USD)	Disbursement Year 1 (USD)	Disbursement Year 2 (USD)	Disbursement Year 3 (USD)	Total disbursements by to-date
Outcome 1	UNDP	62000	GEF	159,893	178,279	84,285	422,457	128,378	158,095	271,447	557,920
Outcome 2:	UNDP	62000	GEF	275,353	406,707	82,434	764,494	267,949	392,105	124,287	784,340
Outcome 3	UNDP	62000	GEF	125,096	537,894	315,956	978,946	67,024	434,841	263,641	765,506
Outcome 4	UNDP	62000	GEF	89,611	184,744	153,472	427,827	53,418	171,424	212,030	436,872
Project management.	UNDP	62000	GEF	124,989	59,680	86,607	271,276	177,131	58,953	100,953	337,037
PROJECT TOTAL				774,942	1,367,304	722,754	2,865,000	693,899	1,215,418	972,357	2,881,674

Table 2 Co-financing planned versus actual
(all amounts in US\$)⁵⁷

Source	Amount (Project Document)*	Actual*	Variance*
UNDP CO(s): Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan	1,961,500	1,354,424	-607,076
Government of Kyrgyzstan	150,000	163,300	+13,300
Government of Kazakhstan	100,000	215,500	+115,500
Government of Turkmenistan	100,000	113,990	+13,990
Government of Tajikistan	100,000	167,000	+67,000
Government of Uzbekistan	100,000	102,635	+2,635
GIZ	500,000	(1,073,634Euro) 1,291,759	+791,759
GM	300,000	120,000	-180,000
BMU	-	79,528**	+79,528
Totals	3,311,500	3,426,861	+115,361
* Amounts include both cash and in-kind			
** Co-financing CIM Expert, Uzbekistan			

⁵⁷ Figures as of July 2012

4.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

Issue	Rating
Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry and implementation	Marginally Satisfactory – things were being monitored but there was little that could be done to adapt the project. The problem of five countries and a regional LFM should have been anticipated during the design phase or if not it should have been addressed more fully during the Inception Phase. BRC and the GEF should have been less intransigent and allowed the LFM to be realigned during the Inception Phase. The MTR appears to have lacked the authority to address the LFM issue and the recommendations were weak

122. The MTR states that: *“the Prodoc [Project Document] describes a detailed monitoring and adaptive management process in 4 pages. This was to be undertaken in collaboration with the CACILM Knowledge Management unit for impact monitoring and refinement of indicators.”*⁵⁸
123. When examined the Project Document states: *“Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be undertaken by the Multi-country Capacity Building Unit and the UNDP Regional Center in Bratislava (BRC) in coordination with the Project Steering Committee (See Management Arrangements), the MSEC, and in cooperation with the CACILM Steering Committee (CSC), in addition to the MSEC and NSEC Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists. The Strategic Results Framework Matrix in Section II provides impact and outcome indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes: an inception workshop and report, project implementation reviews, quarterly operational reports, yearly participative evaluation events, and final evaluation, and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will be presented at the project inception workshop and finalized in the Project Inception Report, following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff including M&E responsibilities.”*⁵⁹
124. The CBU(s) were challenging the LFM, the principal monitoring and evaluation tool for the project and yet it was the *contractual* function of the LFM that was being applied and not the planning and management function, for the sake of argument, an audit. From an adaptive management perspective, and one which might achieve the greatest impact on SLM, surely the first function (adaptive management) should take precedence over the purely contractual use of the LFM?
125. Furthermore, the PSC or Project Board met only once during the project (and a second time at its close). Ideally the PSC should already have had the *“rules and procedures [will be] discussed and agreed”* prior to the inception phase, never mind the inception workshop, because this is when the big decisions needed to be made. The Inception Workshop should essentially have been presenting the changes to the Project Document already agreed by the PSC. The MSEC was phasing out and in all but one of the countries the NSEC(s) didn’t exist and the project’s

⁵⁸ MCB MTR, p. 30

⁵⁹ Project Document, p. 60

executive, the PSC, was going to discuss its *modus operandi* at what is essentially an open meeting. Clearly there was a governance issue at stake.

126. The point being that monitoring and evaluation plans are very similar across all UNDP-GEF projects, and for the large part UNDP has its systems in place to provide very reasonable monitoring and evaluation. However, we can discuss the ATLAS Risk Log, PIR/APR, Tripartite Review⁶⁰ and AWP as much as we like and they are all good things but they remain just that in the absence of good governance. For the avoidance of doubt the project has managed to pull through what has clearly been a difficult process, however had there been a properly constituted executive in place from "day one" then it may have been possible to avoid the tensions between the partners, speed the rate at which decisions were made, the *effectiveness* and *efficiency* of the project. As it seems there was considerable adaptation taking place within the project but this was despite the formalised system that is supposed to facilitate it.

127. Post MTR there appears to have been a significant improvement in following the monitoring and evaluation plan, however, the very significant PSC meeting scheduled for January 2012 never took place.

Table 3 Project monitoring and evaluation

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time frame	Compliance	Comments
Inception Phase	SCP, Project Manager, UNDP	At least the first two months of the project	Yes	PSC was not in place, regional PM was not in place, did not challenge the Project Document
<p>"Equally, the Inception Workshop will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phrasings [sic] and it will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms". Project Document section 4.2.7. These are activities or functions of the inception phase. Leaving these issues until the inception workshop, amongst all the other issues to be dealt with during this workshop and given that the project took almost two years to design, and there are sixty days for the evaluators to decipher the roles, functions and responsibilities a one-day workshop is, on balance, overly optimistic. It is hard not to feel that there is an element of "going through the motions". There is a reason why projects have an inception phase and the process cannot be treated as a list with boxes to be ticked, in the Project Design and in its implementation.</p>				
Inception Workshop (IW)	UNDP	Depending upon the inception phase	Yes	One day event
Inception Report	Executing Agency	Immediately following IW	Yes	Inception report prepared September 2010. The IR did not challenge the LFM and created 5 "informal" country LFM(s)
PIR	UNDP	Annually	Yes	June to July 2011, 2012
Measurement of Means of Verification for	Included in PIR	Annually prior to PIR and to the definition of		LFM was updated during PBM in May, 2011 however, the

⁶⁰ As this was a DIM Execution Modality it did not require a Tripartite Review

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time frame	Compliance	Comments
Project Progress and Performance		annual work plans		FE feels the changes were essentially cosmetic
Steering Committee Meetings	UNDP, GIZ, GM and UNCCD FPs	Following IW and annually thereafter.	Twice	May 11-12, 2011 & December 15 '012
Technical and periodic status reports	MCB staff	As required	Yes	Reports submitted to GEF and UNDP
Mid-term External Evaluation	Independent Consultants	Sep-Oct 2011	Yes	Did not significantly challenge the role of BRC and appears to have lacked the authority to force change upon the project (i.e. PSC meetings, revision and realignment of the LFM, etc.)
Final External Evaluation	UNDP	At the end of project implementation	In progress	N/A
Terminal Report	International Consultant	December 2012-January 2013	N/A	N/A

4.2.6 Implementation and execution modalities, coordination and operational issues

Issue	Rating
UNDP & Implementing Partner implementation/execution, coordination and operational issues	Marginally Satisfactory – the weakness the Project Document to clearly articulate the arrangements, weaknesses in the inception phase, delays in replacing the regional Project manager, etc., inability of the PSC to address the issues have brought the rating down unfortunately because, had the project continued for longer and with the appointment of a substantive regional Project manager the MCB might have put many of these problems behind it.

128. The Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) was probably the only modality possible given the multi-country nature of the project. Coordination and operational issues within a project such as this would be testing to any organisation. There have been problems with the implementation and execution of the project. UNDP has decentralised most functions to the Country Office and this has been both a strength (see section 4.1.6), and also a weakness in this project. Coordination has been difficult, but it is hard to separate this from the lack of a significant regional Project Manager. Clearly there is a case to be made for streamlining the bureaucratic procedures with all five countries citing cases of prolonged delays. It is not clear to what extent these have been improved since the MTR. One must assume that the Inception Workshop did not make clear to the participating CO(s) where each countries limit of responsibilities lay. Going forwards these arrangements would need to be clearly spelled out prior to the start of the project.

129. Notwithstanding the comments made in section 4.2.7, the Project Document further states: *"A Project Inception Workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant governments' counterparts, co-financing partners, UNDP-COs and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. A fundamental objective of the Inception Workshop is to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goals and objectives, as well as to finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan at the national and multi-country levels based on the project's logframe matrix. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions/risks), confirming and synchronizing the national-level activities with the multi-country workplan imparting additional detail as needed, and, on the basis of this exercise, finalize the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. The Inception Workshop will: (i) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF-GTZ expanded team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the responsible BRC, UNDP CO, and GTZ staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of RCU, GTZ, and MSEC staff vis-à-vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews-Annual Project Report (APR-PIRs) and related documentation, Tripartite Review Meetings⁶¹, as well as yearly evaluation events and final evaluations. Equally, the Inception Workshop will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phrasings [sic] and it will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff and decision-making structures will be reiterated to clarify each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. Project Steering Committee rules and procedures will be discussed and agreed."*
130. This continues for some four pages and along with the five and a half pages of management arrangements⁶² which need not be repeated here, not least because it is unlikely to shed any greater light on their meaning. However, there are two important points to be made here. Firstly, there is considerable emphasis on the Inception Workshop, not the inception phase, *per se*. One has to question whether it is reasonable to expect that; if the project took nearly two years to design, all of these things could be decided in a one day workshop. For instance: "Project Steering Committee rules and procedures will be discussed and agreed." Just supposing they were not agreed? There is a presumption⁶³ that the Project document had "got it all right", in the experience of the evaluator this is a common failing in GEF projects where the Project Document is read like a script in a play and it is the players that get their lines wrong.
131. Secondly it states that the BRC will play a supporting role, however, it is hard to see where this occurred to any real effect. When the project was experiencing difficulties the BRC does not appear to have stepped in. Such support could have been an intervention when the project wanted to realign the LFM and we might expect the BRC to have stepped in when the project did not immediately replace the regional Project Manager or regarding the issues with the IFS which do not appear to link the activities with and any proposed financing. The FE acknowledges that the BRC has a tremendous workload which likely accounts for the lack of intervention.
132. Each UNDP CO addressed the national execution arrangements in a slightly different way and there is nothing wrong with this, indeed it is possible that no one way was better than

⁶¹ Tripartite review is UNDP requirement of nationally executed projects but it is not clear whether they are necessary for DIM projects

⁶² Project Document, p. 54 - 60

⁶³ An idea that is taken to be true, and often used as the basis for other ideas, although it is not known for certain. A presumption of a particular fact can be made without the aid of proof in some situations.

another because each situation was slightly different. However, the FE notes that in some instances there were unnecessary delays. Once again the absence of any clear guidelines during the design, or if not then the inception phase coupled with the lack of an effective regional Project Manager through much of the project. Must have contributed to this. While the CTA appears to have tried very hard to step in, with the best will in the world, the position would not have had the authority to ensure that everyone was "singing from the same sheet of music". It is only towards the end of the project with the appointment of a substantive regional Project Manager that we begin to see things beginning to work.

4.3 Results

Issue	Rating
Overall results (attainment of objective)	Satisfactory – three out of the four outcomes are satisfactory. The objective is difficult to measure using the LFM indicators. However, the FE feels that the project, despite the many challenges has made good progress and in the right direction and many of the internal challenges to the project are essentially what the outcomes were intended to address, therefore the working through of these issues within the project, even if they have not reached a clear resolution are a positive outcome. The FE realises that using the rating scale in this way is unusual and only possible because the MCB is framed within the CACILM programme and the lessons and experience generated will be incorporated into future interventions under the CACILM umbrella.

133. Despite these challenges, the project has had a number of notable successes and made some significant progress, indeed, the project has provided some very important insight into the challenges of addressing land degradation within the region and the evaluators are on the whole pleased with the project's progress towards outcomes, although given the weaknesses in the LFM indicators these are, at times, hard to measure objectively.

134. We might go further, and state that it has clearly demonstrated some of the weaknesses inherent in GEF projects and on the whole it has attempted to address these weaknesses in a thoughtful and pragmatic way, but, as is the case with so many of these projects, time was a deciding factor and one which was largely overlooked in the project's design. It is worth considering that getting the internal governance to work and understanding what would not work is in many ways as important as the outcomes themselves; *"remember the two benefits of failure. First, if you do fail, you learn what doesn't work; and second, the failure gives you the opportunity to try a new approach."*⁶⁴

135. The FE will not systematically list the project's achievements made by all of the participating countries these are presented in the regional and individual country LFMs (Annex 4).

⁶⁴ Roger Von Oech

4.3.1 Attainment of Outcomes/Achievements of Objectives

136. The FE has already stated that the ratings of the project will be based upon the *"official"* LFM. This is the LFM that was very slightly revised during the inception phase but subsequently did not include outcome indicators. As a rough measure of how confusing the decision not to realign the project's LFM with the reality once the project had started can be demonstrated by the sixty-nine pages of LFM that makes up the six LFMs in use within the MCB. In the event the FE has taken the decision to rate the outcomes based on its findings during the mission and in the absence of indicators.
137. Table 4 provides the FEs ratings of the MCB outcomes and outputs. The LFM from the Inception Report is confusing and it is hard to attribute whether an indicator is intended for an output or outcome. Indeed it is not clear if the apparent outcome indicators from the LFM presented in the Inception Report were later removed, although this seems hard believe. Therefore the FE has worked from a LFM provided by the project.

Table 4 Project Scoring by Outcome and Output Indicators of Project Document/Inception Report			
	Indicators	Project assessment & FE comments	FE Rating
Objective: Increase capacity at the national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming Framework ⁶⁵ .	0.1. Overall change in national-level status of compulsory indicators for system, institution, and individual levels as measured by a capacity building scorecard.	No results of an external evaluation of the developed score cards exists. Internal self-evaluation results show an increase in most of the score cards.	Unsatisfactory: the exercise was only carried out once (but understandable given the time constraints and problems encountered by the project. The FE feels that had the scorecard been run again during the final year there would have been a positive improvement)
	0.2. Capacity Building Scorecard agreed upon by MSEC.	First Score cards were jointly developed with MSEC (esp. Outcome 4 as a joint outcome of MCB and MSEC). A review of the score cards happened after MSEC did no longer exist; therefore, it could not be involved in the revision process.	Satisfactory: the project has developed a good score card, it would have helped if this had been at the beginning of the project
	0.3. Baseline with scorecard approach and system for monitoring established.	A proper baseline and monitoring system does not exist. Baseline measurements have been done mostly on a self-evaluation basis in the countries in 2012	Marginally Satisfactory: a midterm baseline was established and the scorecard has been developed for future monitoring
	0.4. Number of National and Regional Short Term Capacity Building Action Plans approved.	National short term capacity building action plans have been drafted and partly implemented by the MCB project in all five countries	Satisfactory: Five action plans approved and partially implemented. However, the indicator is not a reasonable measure of the project's impact
Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.			Highly Satisfactory: the project appears to have taken the <i>long view</i> with regards to mainstreaming working carefully and diligently with existing governance structures rather than doing what might have been expedient for the project. In all countries the project appears to have significant capital with decision-makers (<i>trust</i>) and it has facilitated a mainstreaming process, in effect enabling government to work. The degree to which this has taken place has to a large extent depended upon the openness of government and society in each country but the FE feels that all

⁶⁵ Or other national strategic documents in support in the implementation of the UNCCD

			countries have moved the process forwards
Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.	No indicators given for outcomes		Marginally Satisfactory: this is where the project is weakest. Resource mobilization is a long term outcome and with the best will in the world three years is a short term. There were weaknesses in the GM IFS approach. Transposing a system that had worked in other countries with very different experiences and histories needed more TA to adapt and embed the basic template into the transitional systems that are currently developing in the region. To transfer a system developed in one region to another requires much greater TA to support it and constant monitoring, evaluation and adaptation which it appears to have only at the end (November 2012) which, while a very good, frank and honest evaluation, like a final evaluation, is too late to do anything. However, it has made a start and serves as a useful introduction to SLM financing
Outcome 3: Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through human resource development.	No indicators given for outcomes		Satisfactory: There is considerable evidence that the project has been driving this process ensuring there is a vertical integration between state, politicians, technocrats, civil society and local communities. . Given the very different stages each country is at in the transition from a centralized and authoritarian system to a free-market economy and greater democracy the FE feels that the project has done as much as it could in the time available (notwithstanding the delays due to internal challenges to the project)
Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened.	No indicators given for outcomes		Satisfactory: The project has been diligent and at times has challenged its own assumptions suggesting that there is a degree of confidence within the basic project management unit. An important aspect of this is that the project had to break down barriers before introducing new ways of thinking and learning. Given the very different stages each country is at in the transition from a centralized and authoritarian system

			to a free-market economy and greater democracy the FE feels that the project has on the whole done a good job in a short time
Output 1.1. Existing national structures for mainstreaming SLM into policy and legislation are strengthened	1.1.1. Existing national structures in 5 CA countries (NSECs or UNCCD Focal Points / related state agencies) meet regularly and discuss SLM issues to promote UNCCD implementation	By the MCB project, dialogue processes were partly fostered in the countries. Especially thematic exchanges between Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan on legal questions of pasture management were significantly triggered by the project.	The FE agrees and comments that when there was a shared interest (e.g. the emerging approaches to pasture management) this appears to have been a significant driver
	1.1.2. Members of the ACGs or other national level coordination structures to foster UNCCD implementation have received adequate capacity building support.		The FE admits to being puzzled by this indicator
	1.1.3. Level of participation of NSECs, UNCCD Focal point and related state agencies in MCB Project activities.	National structures responsible for the implementation of the UNCCD were actively involved into the project planning and implementation. Moreover, UNCCD national focal points participated in the project steering committee meetings.	The FE agrees with this assessment and comments that, had the PSC (Project Board) been functioning effectively, there was an ideal opportunity to build capacity through their participation the project's executive
	1.1.4. Quantity and quality of integration of the projects and activities for SLM into the national strategic documents.	IFS developed in each country but have to be improved and ownership in the countries is lacking. Through MCB several initiatives on drafting of national strategies in the field of SLM were financially supported.	The FE agrees with this assessment
Output 1.2. Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing.	1.2.1. Quantity and quality of integration of the SLM principles into the governmental programs in CA countries.		The FE admits to being puzzled by this indicator

	<p>1.2.2. Quantity and quality of integration of the SLM principles into the legislation in CA countries.</p>	<p>Forest code in Tajikistan (well integrated mechanisms, however, sub-laws and capacities for implementation still lacking) Pasture law in Tajikistan (draft version handed in; sustainable use of pasture lands not assured by the current version; many open question regarding its implementation) Pasture law Kazakhstan (did not see the draft version so far; however, very difficult task in Kazakhstan due to different pasture situations which basically call for differentiated approaches) Sub-laws pasture legislation Kyrgyzstan support to the working group on drafting of several sub-laws which actually are helpful to regulate the pasture law implementation with regard to sustainable use. Revision of the pasture law Kyrgyzstan was supported in order to clarify important aspects which had led to problems during implementation of the first law (e. g. borderline definitions; regulation of wildlife management on pasture lands)</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this assessment. Indeed this is an area where the project has really proved its worth. An interesting aspect of the changes made in the LFM outputs appears to be a change in the emphasis from regional to national. Most of the outputs are those that can be adapted to suit each countries specific circumstance. It is possible that a lesson about a regional approach versus a multi-country approach is emerging from the changes made in the LFM and this may well have important implications to the way in which CACILM goes forwards in the future</p>
--	---	---	--

	1.2.3. Quantity and quality of integration of the SLM incentive mechanisms into the legislation and national strategic documents in CA countries.	Forest law in Tajikistan does allow for joint forest management mechanisms which were tested for several years beforehand by UNDP SLM project in SW Tajikistan and GIZ in the Pamir region. This is an essential mechanism for sustainable use of mostly riparian forests which, however, could be applied to other forest lands which have a production rate viable for economic use (no juniperus!). Strategy paper for a forest sector reform in Kyrgyzstan (support to the working group by consultations, consultants): however, the document leaves many questions open, ownership not yet seen by the Kyrgyz government and experiences lacking on mechanisms of forest management which actually function in the country given its frame and natural conditions.	The FE agrees with this assessment and adds that this is critical to our understanding of the processes taking place which were not reflected in the Project Document. That is, the MCB was at times being driven by broader reform processes and times it may have been driving these processes or at least facilitating them. While the normative documents that have emerged are not the "whole story" they mark important steps in what we can reasonably say is the right direction to achieving resilience in land management. For instance, in varying degrees the reforms that the MCB was driving are transferring decision-making powers to a level that more effectively and equitably reflects what takes place upon the land. Experience shows that this is rarely a linear or unidirectional process but the project has made good progress in a challenging environment
Output 1.3. Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies	1.3.1. Level of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies demonstrate awareness.	Survey was not conducted.	

	1.3.2. Development of the information materials and knowledge building activities responding to the needs of decision-makers	Many different initiatives on fostering exchange and further development of skills and knowhow of decision makers. This has indeed led to an increased exchange between the countries even beyond the project initiatives and at working level and can be counted as a major success of the project. At regional level, one should mention: Support to a regional pasture management forum in Kyrgyzstan including the organization of a study tour to pilot regions of GIZ and UNDP project sites and the facilitation of exchanges in the regions for parliamentarians of Tajikistan and experts of Kazakhstan. Regional Dare to Share forum in Almaty Nov. 2012 with high level participation, especially to allow a reflection about the first CACILM phase (results, lessons learnt...) but also to look ahead of new initiatives (CACILM 2 via IFAD Regional Project and Flermonca EU)	The FE agrees with this assessment and comments that stakeholders have really valued the MCB in this context providing a "safe environment" for sharing both successes and failures. An interesting aspect and one worth noting for the design of any future CACILM programme is the manner in which the MCB achieved this, effectively behaving as a service provider to the state, parliament, NGOs, technocrats and local communities.
Output 2.1. National multi-stakeholder working group is established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing IFSs.	2.1.1. Defined baseline financial flows to SLM by national project teams.		This was far too complicated a task for the MCB.
	2.1.2. Level of increase in baseline financial flows to SLM.		See above, the indicator is irrelevant if the baseline cannot be determined.
	2.1.3. Adaptation of training modules for IFS on national levels.		It appears that there are training modules but training is far from complete and it is likely they will still need adapting
	2.1.4. Number of persons qualified to develop Integrated Financing Strategies in CA countries.		Participants have received a "starter" but it would imprudent to consider them trained in developing integrated financing strategies because the IFS themselves are not necessarily suitable

Output 2.2: Integrated Financing Strategy drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.	2.2.1. Number of the Integrated Financing Strategies developed and submitted for approval by appropriate national authorities.		All five countries have developed IFS(s) however none have been approved by governments and it is likely to be difficult to approve them because mechanism how to incorporate the IFS into UNCCD NAP or any other national strategic documents not clear or no such mechanisms exists. Furthermore, there is little experience of financial strategies in the region and it will take time for governments to fully understand them in a way that they can be meaningfully integrated into the broader planning framework. The IFS were endorsed by different agencies and NSEC (in Uzbekistan) but they were not approved and accepted as standalone strategies to inflow funds into SLM sector. Following adaptive management, the RPMU strongly recommended to mainstream the main sections of IFS into any relevant national strategic documents to ensure follow up and possible implementation. (mainstreamed into green economy in KZ, agrarian sector reform in TJK, NAP in KG, etc). more details brought in above sections.
Output 2.3: SLM Integrated Investment Frameworks Developed.	2.3.1. Number of SLM Integrated Investment Frameworks developed in accordance with Integrated Financing Strategies.		See above
Output 2.4: National SLM investment projects developed and submitted for financing.	2.4.1. Number of project concepts developed on the basis of Integrated Investment Frameworks and submitted for financing.		There is no evidence of this having occurred. Indeed a criticism of the IFS is that it identifies activities but does not match that with funding streams.

<p>Output 3.1: National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plans and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders responsible for interaction between state agencies and land users are integrated into relevant national strategic documents.</p>	<p>3.1.1. The number CBUs established within the national project teams.</p>	<p>CBUs were established and functioning. However, with continuous drawbacks during implementation of the project.</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement and adds that time was lost during the first year of the project and it is reasonable to assume that had there been a substantive regional Project Manager in place throughout the project it would have greatly improved the situation</p>
	<p>3.1.2. Progress of development of 5 National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plans and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.</p>	<p>Short-term CB action plans were developed by almost each country, however belated by about 1.5 years in Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Tajikistan. Uzbekistan was the only country to actually make use of the strategy and implement it. Application of the strategy which was developed in Turkmenistan unknown. Long-term CB building priorities identified in some countries and partly ready for integration into NAP Alignment process.</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement</p>
	<p>3.1.3. Quantity and quality of activities conducted for the implementation of the 5 National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plans for SLM stakeholders</p>	<p>Implementation only actively followed in Uzbekistan. (see above)</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement</p>

	3.1.4. Inclusion of the national-level long-term Capacity Building priorities into Relevant national strategic documents.	Partly integrated into the IFS (which however are not ready for implementation at the moment). Moreover, CTA actively supported the development of a regional IFAD grant project with regional KM on SLM as a central focus. This project will start in January 2013 and MCB may handover the information and survey results to this project for further uptake during the next years.	The FE agrees with this statement (see comments outcome 2 above)
Output 3.2: Mechanisms for communication and coordination between state organizations and land users are enhanced.	3.2.1. Development of plans to improve vertical communication and coordination between different levels of stakeholders.	Surveys and work on improved communication and coordination between state and local stakeholders were implemented in most countries (Exception possibly TKM). e. g. community radio efforts supported in Kyrgyzstan; exchange visits organized for pasture committee members together with the pasture department of the MoA in Kyrgyzstan; awareness raising events in Uzbekistan on SLM with high level decision makers' participation. A regional tailor-made workshop on managing stakeholder dialogues was organized by GIZ mainly and seemed to have been very useful (theoretical inputs were combined with practical work on actual stakeholder processes in the countries).	The FE agrees with this statement
	3.2.2. Relevant capacity building activities to improve vertical communication and coordination between different levels of stakeholders included into short-term Capacity Building Action Plans for SLM stakeholders.	Proved to be unrealistic and not corresponding to the actual national demands	The FE agrees with this statement. See also comments on indicator 3.1.2 & 3.1.3 above). The FE also observe that this was going to be one of the most challenging tasks for the project because it would have to start making changes at high levels before these could be transferred down to the local/land user/community level

Output 3.2: Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.	3.3.1. Number of persons trained in CA countries using Modular training programmes (e.g. collaborative land-use planning, Designing Integrated Financing Strategies, Participatory SLM Project Design Basics).	Done. However, due to very belated strategic approaches towards this target (late short-term CB action plan development), trainings were rather organized in opportunistic manner instead of following an underlying strategic approach.	The FE agrees with this statement
	3.3.2. The number of trainers trained in CA countries using Modular training programmes (e.g. collaborative land-use planning, Designing Integrated Financing Strategies, Participatory SLM Project Design Basics).	Done (also as above, except for the IFS activities)	The FE agrees with this statement (see comments outcome 2 above)

<p>Output 4.1: Stakeholders relevant for SLM actively exchange thematic information and experiences.</p>	<p>4.1.1. The number of learning and consultative activities to exchange thematic information and experiences.</p>	<p>Done. At regional level: Regional Dare to Share in Nov. 2012 with participation of high level decision makers from each country except Turkmenistan; international experts' participation as well as participation of practitioners and experts from each country. Exchange of information and experiences on thematic areas of forest, pasture and wildlife management as well as water management and adaptation to climate change. Donors meeting in the frame of this event proved to become a platform for concrete commitments for a second phase of CACILM. Conference part of the event provided in-depth insight into CACILM 1 results and lessons learnt, launch of a regional SLM platform as well as future perspectives of the CACILM initiative. Support of the organization of the Global WOCAT Conference in Kyrgyzstan in 2011. Support of and participation in a global pastoralism conference in 2011 in Kyrgyzstan. Co-organizing and participation in a regional pasture management conference in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 2011. Support of the 1st National Forum on Organic Agriculture in Kyrgyzstan, December 2012</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement and adds that the project has had a multiplier or incremental value to other initiatives which has been important because projects have a tendency to be "inward-looking" whereas the MCB has actively engaged with other projects. Whether this by luck or design is not clear. Perhaps it may be due to the "culture" of CACILM projects to integrate with other initiatives and the FE feels that the embedded CTA may also have had a role in this as has the selection of national Project Managers and more recently the regional Project Manager. An example of this is the posting of "Best Practices" on the WOCAT website, these are not MCB "Best Practices" but those of other initiatives</p>
<p>Output 4.2: Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>4.2.1. Number of best practices documented and disseminated on national and regional levels.</p>	<p>Documentation done with high quality documentations according to the WOCAT System. Dissemination partly approached (via publication of materials, exchange events including exhibitions, targeted ToTs, various trainings).</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement (see also previous comment)</p>

	<p>4.2.2. Number of conducted trainings for governmental structures, NGOs and land users to disseminate SLM best practices on national and regional levels.</p>	<p>For Uzbekistan: 6 trainings on best practises were conducted and 6 events were organised with giving presentations of BP to stakeholders</p> <p>National Forum was planned as final event for the Project in Uzbekistan but not conducted. Two events dedicated to International Combat Desertification Day were conducted with participation of wide range of stakeholders in 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>National level – 8 in KG</p> <p>National - 4: 1. National Forum on building network among the SLM organizations, December 2010</p> <p>2. National workshop on best practices for WOCAT, May 2011</p> <p>3. National workshop for community radio, April 2011, September 2012</p> <p>4. The I National Forum on Organic Agriculture, December 2012</p> <p>22 trainings in TJK</p> <p>TKM</p> <p>5 trainings at national level and 5 at regional level.</p>	
	<p>4.2.3. Number of printed and distributed brochures and leaflets on the SLM best practices in Russian and local languages.</p>	<p>Done, actually, much more than one per country. Would need to add the list of publications in order to quantify. Quality of those publications varies.</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement List of publications is attached in Annex 5</p>

<p>Output 4.3: Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.</p>	<p>4.3.1. Development of the strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices and approval by the MCB Project Board.</p>	<p>Still working on it. However, CTA of the project was very intensively involved in designing two new regional projects: IFAD regional grant with regional KM on SLM as a central focus and a regional EU project covering forest, wildlife and pasture management in each CA country as well as regional knowledge management. It has been agreed that a proper handover of follow-up work may be organized by MCB with regard to the EU project grant (which will be implemented by GIZ). Furthermore, materials and strategic documents developed by MCB will be shared with the colleagues responsible for the IFAD project implementation.</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement and also notes that the IFS has been covered in this way (see Annex 4). The process has been greatly facilitated by the development of a coherent "exit strategy"</p>
	<p>4.3.2. Scoping of the SLM best practices discussed at national and regional levels.</p>	<p>done</p>	<p>The FE agrees with this statement</p>
	<p>4.3.3. Number of the National Forums conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.</p>	<p>In KG: National - 4: 1. National Forum on building network among the SLM organizations, December 2010 2. National workshop on best practices for WOCAT, May 2011 3. National workshop for community radio, April 2011, September 2012 4. The I National Forum on Organic Agriculture, December 2012</p> <p>, 1 in TKM</p> <p>National Forum was planned as final event for the Project in Uzbekistan but not conducted. Two events dedicated to International Combat Desertification Day were conducted with participation of wide range of stakeholders in 2011 and 2012.</p>	

4.3.2 Relevance

Issue	Rating
Relevance	Highly Satisfactory – the MCB was a bold and innovative project and is closely aligned with many of the reform processes taking place within the region <i>viz a viz</i> pasture management reform, civil society, <i>etc.</i> The high rating is possible because the project was pushing the boundaries and moving from a technical intervention to supporting a process of developing natural resource governance.

138. Relevance is defined as the extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time as well as the extent the activities contribute towards attainment of global environmental benefits.

139. As the MCB was framed within the larger CACILM programme and an adequate case was made in the Project Document⁶⁶ the project was certainly relevant. As has been earlier discussed the MCB appears to have been closely aligned with the early stages of reform, something that has been visible through its engagement with parliamentary process and facilitating the reform of pasture management, *etc.*

140. The MCB was very relevant to the GEF focal area, strategic priorities and the relevant operational program as has been described earlier in section 3.1.

141. The project's design has been criticised in the FE, however, broadly speaking the objective and outcomes were relevant. While they could have been more explicitly focused on addressing issues of governance as a means to improving land management this has to be weighed against the regional political arena and there may well have been considerable resistance to a project that was through its design, critical of existing forms of governance.

4.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency

Issue	Rating
Effectiveness	Satisfactory – the MCB appears to have put process before project <i>expedience</i> in most of its activities and has had a capacity to analyse, learn and communicate ideas
Efficiency	Marginally Satisfactory – all of the above could probably have been done less painfully. However, many of the difficulties faced have been largely due to the design and under-resourcing of elements of the project (<i>e.g.</i> regional travel for team building and strategy workshops, <i>etc.</i>). Decisions could have been made more expeditiously through the PSC and the issues relating to the M&E and LFM have brought this rating down
Effectiveness & Efficiency	Satisfactory – overall the effectiveness outweighs the issues relating to efficiency

⁶⁶ Project Document p. 50 - 52

142. *Effectiveness* is a measure of the extent to which the project has achieved its main objective and its outcomes. These would normally be based upon the achievements of objective measures or indicators set out in the project's LFM. However, considering the findings set out in section 4.3.1 and the confusion over the use of the LFM throughout the project and the weakness of the indicators, there is a contradiction in the achievement of the indicators and the progress towards the outcomes and the objective.
143. Despite all the problems the project has faced, *inter alia*, the numerous delays, complicated design, *etc.*, and the mistakes that it has made, *inter alia*, failing to completely realign the LFM, the poor inception phase, the delay in replacing the regional Project Manager, *etc.*, the MCB project has actually done remarkably well. How much of this has been down to the character of individuals within the project and the fact that it has had a capacity to "*think*" and to solve problems and how much can be attributed to external drivers such as the reform processes taking place, increasing civil society activity, *etc.*, is hard to determine. The FE realises that this may come as a shock to many involved in the project; who may have thought at times that there were more mistakes than successes, but in reality the MCB is different from most other projects, certainly it was different from the three other CMPF elements of research, information systems (GIS) and knowledge management that had gone before. The MCB was always going to make mistakes, some might have been avoided but others were simply a "*judgement call*".⁶⁷ On this basis the FE judges that the project was effective.
144. *Efficiency* involves an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Once again, this is not straight forward. The project was almost certainly underfunded. For a multi-country project that would have needed to significant travel there was poor provision for travel. For a novel project that would require significant adaptation there was insufficient allocation for monitoring and evaluation. In effect it was six small-sized projects (see sections 4.2.4 and 4.2.7). While the project has completed almost all the scheduled activities there have been significant delays and lastly it has been discussed at length that there was insufficient time allowed for the project which has certainly lessened the impact of many activities and therefore reduced the cost-efficiency, as has the weaknesses in establishing the internal governance and regional coordination. On that basis the FE feels that the MCB was not efficient although it should be noted that there have been significant improvements in the last stages of the project.

4.3.4 Country ownership

145. The FE feels that there was a strong country ownership of the project, processes and outcomes. Indeed this has clearly "*spilled out*" into the stakeholder organisations. A measure of this is demonstrated by the clearly affectionate way that Parliamentarians spoke about the MCB and how it had facilitated their work, which is no small achievement to engage with an essentially political process without "*playing politics*" is a difficult balancing act and one which the project should be congratulated on. However, this national ownership has, at times, created a tension between the multi-country aspects and the national aspirations. Once again, this might have been avoided had there been strong project leadership by a regional Project Manager all through the project and not just in the closing months. One of the challenges of this project, indeed a *raison d'être*⁶⁸, was to develop an approach to land degradation at both a national and

⁶⁷ A judgment call is a decision where there are no firm rules or principles that can help you make it, so you simply have to rely on your own judgement and instinct

⁶⁸ Reason for existence

regional scale. The team building and other exercises have gone a long way to developing this within the project and the FE can't help feeling that if there had been three years, rather than six months, of effective regional project leadership by a dedicated regional Project Manager there might have been something more fully developed in terms of national versus regional ownership. As it stands the FE feels that the project was moving in this direction and is therefore satisfied with this aspect of the MCB.

4.3.5 Mainstreaming

146. Mainstreaming involves, amongst other things, the take up of project piloted approaches within the national policy framework. There is sufficient evidence that the results of the MCB were being mainstreamed, one need look no further than the work carried out on the legislation pertaining to pasture management which provides a very interesting example of how the project was taking initiatives that were not necessarily developed by the MCB but nonetheless needed to be adapted and "*fine tuned*" through a process of developing by-laws, legal provisions, enactment and embedding at the level of resource users if they were to become operational in a legal sense. However, perhaps the best example of mainstreaming can be found in the project's involvement with the UNCCD National Action Plan (NAP) alignment process where project generated experience is being integrated into the NAP(s).

4.3.6 Sustainability

Issue	Rating
Sustainability	Likely – the outcomes from the project are useful and have been mainstreamed into the enabling environment. The job is far from over but the individuals tasked with continuing with this process are better equipped to carry it out
Financial sustainability	Moderately Likely – the IFS(s) need work but the continued support from the second generation. However, in the short to medium term the CACILM II and Flermoneca funding is likely to continue the process
Socio-political sustainability	Likely – the project has been addressing SLM through existing socio-political means
Institutional sustainability	Likely – the project has through a facilitation process transferred many of its skills and functions to existing institutional players
Environmental sustainability	Likely - it is reasonable for the FE to judge that the MCB has contributed to making land management more resilient in the region and thus, sustainable

147. In GEF terms sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived results and impacts after the external project funding and assistance ends. This can be measured as socio-political sustainability, financial resources, institutional frameworks and environmental sustainability.

148. By no means could it be said that the work of the MCB is completed and sustainable. However, the FE can point to a number of situations, mechanisms and plausible future scenarios

and state that there is every likelihood that the effects of the project will endure beyond the end of the GEF funding. These might include:

- Embedding the project outcomes in the parliamentary process and developing the capacity of local administration and resource users to utilise these opportunities.
- Developing the IFS, which admittedly needs work but still represents a step in the right direction, and through the remaining CACILM structures; ensuring that there is continued project support to the process of reforming land management so that it is sustainable (e.g. CACILM II through the planned IFAD Regional Project and EU-funded Flermoneca). There is of course an argument that a project's outcomes are not sustainable if they require continued support but the FE dismisses that argument as wholly unrealistic. As the project is one of the few tools available for engaging with a process, then each project can be considered sustainable if it takes steps in the right direction.
- Institutional sustainability may seem more problematic, particularly with the disappearance of many of the CACILM structures, but the FE takes the view that many of the functions of the early CACILM programme have migrated into the emerging political, governmental and institutional structures as natural resource governance develops.
- Sustainability is impossible to predict, indeed given the complexity and dynamic nature of the systems we seek to manage it is a flawed concept and it might be better to replace the *sustainability* with a more appropriate term: *resilience*. If "*resilience is determined not only by a systems ability to buffer or absorb shocks, but also by its capacity for learning and self-organisation to adapt to change*"⁶⁹ then this has been at the core of the MCBs approach and one of the reasons why the FE has struggled with the project's design because it is hard to see from the Project Document quite how this has emerged. However, it is reasonable for the FE to judge that the MCB has contributed to making land management more resilient in the region and thus, sustainable.

4.3.7 Impact

149. Clearly the MCB has had an impact, more so than just the obvious strain it has placed upon the project partners. The FE report began by saying that the MCB was never going to be an easy project to execute and this is reiterated here. However, the MCB has moved the regional aspects (as separate from the nationally executed demonstration projects) of CACILM from an earlier output focused approach to a process oriented approach.
150. From the FE's understanding it has been bridging a gap between the first phase of CACILM and what will follow on from this. In this aspect alone the lessons should have a significant impact on the "next generation" of CACILM projects.
151. However, perhaps the greatest impact has been on the way that, institutionally and individually, thinking about SLM has changed due to the project's intervention. By way of example: in Uzbekistan the FE were told by a high level technocrat that having been involved in the MCB it was now possible for a farmer to pick up the telephone and speak to him and he would listen. The FE assumes that this was what was intended in the Project Document which talked about: "*important vehicles for upstream and downstream communication in response to the vertical barriers to the upward mobilization of information and experiences generated from CACILM projects.*"⁷⁰ However, it must be said that the Uzbek interviewee expressed it in a way that was more comprehensible.

⁶⁹ Gunderson, L.H. and Holling, C.S. Eds. (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Washington, DC. Island Press.

⁷⁰ Project Document, p. 14

5 Recommendations

152. There are many possible recommendations, and indeed lessons that have been generated by the MCB. However, the FE has taken the view that those working within the project know what they are doing and are on the whole, doing a good job. Each country and at the regional level, this project has generated interesting ideas, largely due to the calibre of the people involved. There is a danger that providing too many recommendations and lessons will confuse what has been a complex and challenging project. Therefore the FE has limited the number of recommendations and lessons.
153. With the project closing it is important that the major partners (UNDP and GIZ) continue to engage with the process of reform that has been gradually taking place over the life of CACILM and therefore the recommendations will be designed to assist this. It is hoped that the recommendations provided by the FE will assist the principle partners in designing the next generation of projects.
154. Furthermore, the recommendations should be read with the view that the FE has argued. That is, that this project had moved significantly from capacity building as a means to provide skills largely of a technocratic nature, to an approach which engaged with the process of developing good natural resource governance.
155. Not only was it the first multi-country approach by UNDP but it was also moving into an area (governance) which is by its very nature "*uncharted*" and there were no quick and easy "*off-the-shelf*" solutions that could be reached for, indeed the challenges of developing the project's own governance structures and processes were a microcosm of the larger challenges the project was seeking to address. What is meant by governance in this instance is "*the means for achieving direction, control, and coordination that determines the effectiveness of management*"⁷¹.
156. UNDP and GIZ are both agencies which are uniquely positioned to deliver this type of "*soft*" assistance which is critical for the success of larger CACILM type interventions. Both organisations have strong governance mandates in their country programmes. UNDP has an element of national "*ownership*" due to its decentralised Country Offices and considerable human, material and logistical resources at its disposal. GIZ has access to high quality TA and can deploy this TA rapidly when needed, as well as having access to considerable in-house experiences that can be brought to bear on an issue. As far as the FE can determine there are few other agencies that can cope with the difficulties of implementing and executing projects such as this and at a regional scale while acting more in the fashion of a *service provider* to other initiatives and projects than as a project *per se*.
157. Four recommendations are made at this point of the FE, however it is likely as a result of the further analysis while developing the Final Report that a number of additional recommendations will emerge, for instance relating to the sequencing of events during the project's cycle (*e.g.* establishing regional coordination before country management arrangements are in place, "*calling in*" an MTR before the midpoint if a project is encountering problems, *etc.*)
- Greater thought is given to building the capacity of project staff. It is unrealistic and unfair to expect project staff to come fully equipped with the requisite skills to carry out work. No successful business would expect this of its managers. Technical Assistance (TA) is different and TA would be expected to provide these skills and experience from the start.
 - Any future CACILM initiative would greatly benefit from having the support of a project similar to the MCB but specifically designed to deliver capacity building particularly as it relates to natural resource governance. It is hard to see how this could be established within the body of a project, that is a project functioning as a *service provider* to other projects on

⁷¹ *Ibid.* (Eagles 2008).

an *ad hoc* basis as needs are identified; but it would be a powerful multiplier to existing and planned projects.

Recommendations to GEF and BRC

Recommendation 1: Adaptive management and the LFM

Responsibility: BRC & GEF.

Timeframe for decision: Before the design of any future project.

158. The log frame matrix (LFM) is the principal planning and, monitoring and evaluation tool for GEF projects. As such it is very useful, but it is just a tool. It should be clearly recognised that the LFM serves two functions. Firstly it is a planning and monitoring tool establishing a logical hierarchy of objective, outcomes, outputs, and down to the level of activities necessary to achieve the objective. Furthermore, it develops indicators necessary to track progress and measure the effectiveness or impact of an intervention. However, it also functions as a contractual tool ensuring that there is conformity to the projects stated objective preventing "mission creep"⁷².
159. There should be clear guidelines drawn up to distinguish between the planning, monitoring and evaluation function of a project LFM and its contractual function. As the recommendation to improve project governance (see below) makes clear, projects are at the mercy of events, both internal and external. By their very nature GEF projects are operating in a highly dynamic, complex and unpredictable environment. They are interacting with multiple drivers, socio-political, economic and environmental. All subject to sudden change. This is why GEF works through an adaptive management approach and this is why sometimes an LFM may need to be realigned with the circumstances that the project is experiencing, or as assumptions made during the design do not hold true.
160. When a project requests a change to the LFM there needs to be a clear pathway in which the request and justification are made, a decision should be made depending on the level of changes required (i.e. depending on where in the logical hierarchy such as outcome, output or activity). If the decision needs to be referred to the GEF then there should be a system to "red-flag" the request as a project in progress to expedite the request. Clearly these positions are overloaded with work but any delay in making a decision about a LFM once a project is in progress is simply wasting money. In this case the changes were justified and in the event, the changes that were allowed resulted in six LFMs amounting to sixty-nine pages⁷³ and considerable confusion. It is the opinion of the FE that realigning the LFM with the circumstances would have been a worthy capacity building exercise in itself.
161. The LFM is a product of a design phase that is far from perfect but remains the best that we have. Clearly there are problems with the review of project log frames because this is a commonly encountered problem with GEF projects and it is not unthinkable that the LFM that emerges from this process contains mistakes. This is the point when the planning, monitoring and adaptive management of the LFM begins to conflict with the contractual function. The LFM states the purpose for which the GEF grant was given⁷⁴; therefore it should not be deviated from. However, to err is human but to persist in error is folly⁷⁵ and mistakes will be made in the

⁷² The expansion of a project or mission beyond its original objectives and goals.

⁷³ Due the under-budgeting of the M&E component the FE has not bothered to count how many indicators this equates to

⁷⁴ For which an individual is ultimately responsible for and thus there is a tendency to "*play it cautiously*" and stick to the contractual function which carries much less risk

⁷⁵ From the Roman philosopher Seneca: "*Errare humanum est, sed in errare perseverare diabolicum.*" Literally "*to err is human but to persist in error is diabolical*". *Err* meaning to make a mistake

development of log frames, situations change and assumptions do not hold true. To not adjust the LFM in the face of experience, changes in circumstances and the testing of assumptions is to follow the same project trajectory....only to find that the target has moved. GEF projects cannot be adaptive unless there is a possibility to make quite significant changes to a LFM and to do this very quickly.

162. The FE will not describe the type of process that need be followed; this would require much more careful thought than the resources available to the FE. However it is not that difficult to determine whether a project is moving the goalposts or changing the state of play to score a goal, really, it is not that difficult.

Recommendation 2: Complex projects should have dedicated monitoring and evaluation officers

Responsibility: BRC & GEF.

Timeframe for decision: Before the design of any future project.

163. Future projects should include, in addition to the normal staffing compliment a dedicated Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. This need not be every project; however complex projects, and the MCB was undoubtedly complex, cannot rely on over-worked project managers or CTA to develop the monitoring programme. The project's Inception Report simply states that the situation has changed, re-states the monitoring and evaluation programme from the Project Document and then provides six more LFMs that are at variance with the original LFM. There are outcome indicators (presumably) combined with output indicators and no explanation as to how this situation was arrived at. The FE has to confess to being very confused and this is not unusual in GEF projects.
164. In reality there is considerable monitoring and evaluation within a GEF project. There is an audit function (*i.e.* is the project doing what it said it would), if the project is doing what it said it would do; *is it working?*, the evaluation function, and if not what is it that we didn't understand about the problem in the first place and what do we need to change; the adaptive management function.
165. Projects such as the MCB have considerable capacity to make changes and to generate lessons that increases our understanding of how interventions can be better designed in the future. Given the current state of the global finances every dollar will count and monitoring and evaluation needs to be taken more seriously.

Recommendations to UNDP and BRC

Recommendation 3: Developing the projects governance

Responsibility: UNDP, project Partner(s), BRC.

Timeframe for decision: Before the design of any future project.

166. When asked what represented the greatest challenge for a statesman, Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1957 to 1963 replied: '*Events, my dear boy, events*'. Projects are operating in a highly dynamic environment. Therefore the speed at which decisions are made has to correspond to the speed of events. Imagine that a project is conceptualised in year one, designed over two years, might take a further year for approval and we might further add a year for other delays. By the time it actually starts "on the ground" events have invariably moved on. Therefore it needs a highly dynamic executive, with a clear understanding of its roll

and responsibilities, and with rules for its operation. Guidelines for this are easily available from a number of sources, including the internet. Without effective governance even the best-planned project is liable to be shaped by both internal and external events rather than the other way around.

167. Therefore the FE recommends that the project governance, in this case the PSC, or Project Board as it became known as, should be properly constituted during the project development phase (including at least one meeting to constitute the membership) so that it is operational from the very start and particularly during the inception phase. This should include defining the membership and the formulation and signing of any substantive agreements between project partners.
168. The FE realises that this would not be easily done and that it would take significant powers away from the UNDP CO which has a greater burden of the administrative aspects of any GEF project. However, it might provide a platform for the CO to work at a multi-country scale. Therefore the whole issue needs careful thinking through prior to the development of a project. Furthermore, the costs of these meetings, and they need to be scheduled several times a year as well as on an *ad hoc* basis when need requires, would be considerable for a multi-country project, there is no escaping this fact, good governance requires investment and this needs to be weighed against the efficiency and effectiveness benefits that would result from having a properly constituted project executive. The lesson, from which this recommendation is derived, might be more spending on process and less on outputs.

6 Lessons Learned

Lesson1: There should be better use of the project cycle to enhance adaptive management

169. There are a number of critical phases in any GEF project that can affect its progress towards achieving the objective. Beginning with the project design these are: the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) review, the Inception Phase (including the Inception Workshop and report) and the Mid-term Review. Forget the Final Evaluation; it is really not important because by then it is too late. The difference is that all but the FE are part of the adaptive management process of the project; the FE is simply reporting what has happened.
170. The issues regarding the LFM have been discussed *ad nauseam* and it is important to focus on the other aspects of adaptive management because GEF projects, like most other projects are rarely the product of careful and considered design, indeed they are more often a collection of assumptions, wishes, hopes and compromises, and in amongst this there are good and bad projects. Therefore it is critical that any project is continually challenged, this is the basis of adaptive management.
171. The first point at which a project is challenged in this way is through the STAP review which is directed at the project's design. However, in the evaluators experience it is not uncommon for the STAP review to be missing, whether as an oversight or the document is simply lost is not clear. However, the STAP review is the first challenge to the project's design.
172. The second opportunity is the inception phase. However inception phases are rarely effective. The purpose of the inception phase is to consolidate the planning team, to define the current and near-future status of the project, to discuss and review the project strategy with stakeholders, refine the project log frame, put in place the necessary logistics and further refine the ToR, including those ToRs for the individual specialists. The major output of the inception phase should be the revised log frame (if changes are made and including any changes to the project's design) and Inception Report (IR), which, on agreement with the Project Steering Committee, UNDP CO and GEF, will form a necessary flexible basis for implementation.
173. It is also an opportunity to develop the project team and ensure that they have adequate skills to carry out the project. There is an assumption that the project staff (unlike Technical Assistance consultants) has the requisite skills. This is generally a false and unreasonable

assumption, particularly with an innovative project (as was the MCB). Therefore the Inception Phase should also be used to build the project's team and ensure that they have skills to carry out the project.

174. In complex projects (such as the MCB) it is critical that the Project Manager is engaged at the earliest possible point, before the Inception Phase. It is nonsensical to have the Inception Phase without the Project manager in place, this is their role. Furthermore they should be involved in interviewing and engaging the other technical staff prior to the Inception Phase.
175. The third point in the project cycle is the MTR. It should be possible to "call in", ahead of the projects half way, a MTR if the project is experiencing difficulties and the MTR should have sufficient authority to place conditions on the continued funding. For instance in the case of the MCB the MTR could have made continued funding by GEF conditional on realigning the project's LFM.

Lesson 2: Team building, embedded technical assistance and personal development

176. A striking feature of the MCB has been the use of embedded TA providing a mentoring and training role to the national project staff. There are two aspects of this, the use of TA and the way in which the project personnel have responded by taking the experience and expanding it. The FE recognises that the use of embedded TA has not been uniform across the five countries and initially was not at the right level (*i.e.* embedded within the CBU(s)).
177. There is frequently an assumption in projects that project personnel should not benefit from any training and capacity building provided by the project. However, investment in human resources is almost always cost-effective and it is unreasonable to assume that national staff will necessarily have the requisite set of skills to prosecute a project. Providing good quality TA staff with training and mentoring mandates during the early stages of the project, possibly defined during the inception phase when an assessment of the skill needs can be made.
178. The other aspect of this is the assumption that, within any project, the staff will automatically form a team. Invariably team building is dependent upon strong leadership. In the case of the MCB it is striking how, following the somewhat chaotic leadership up until the mid-term, a team building exercise was able to pull the different CBUs together to form a tightly knit group which were able to support each other on a diversity of issues from dealing with the intricacies of UNDP-GEF reporting, technical aspects of the work, developing specific legislation and even dealing with difficult individuals in office or basic travel arrangements. The lesson being that this didn't happen by accident it required careful planning and investment of TA time, travel by all the CBUs, *etc.*

Lesson 3: Using a project as a service provider

179. One of the remarkable things about the MCB is that in many ways it has functioned as a service provider to other projects and initiatives. The FE considers that this was implicit in the project's design which is one reason that the FE has been cautious about criticising the design too much. The basic idea was good; the presentation in the Project Document was confusing (as well as being overly ambitious). However, what emerged is a project behaving as if it were a service provider both financially and technically. Using targeted inputs to other initiatives it has been able to expand these initiatives and also to extend them to different areas and across borders. A good example of this has been in the development of the Pasture Laws. While the basic law is not a product of the project *per se*; the enabling of the legislation and its implementation would not have happened as rapidly or effectively (even though this is still a work in progress in many respects) as it has done had the project not been facilitating the process.
180. This may seem unremarkable and perhaps it was simply what the project was meant to do, but the FE singles this out as an important lesson that would need closer scrutiny than the FE can provide to determine what factors enabled this. An important point to make with this is that

there was always a very real risk that the project would simply default to a small grant dispersal mechanism. This has not been the case. The reasons for this would likely include the close oversight of UNDP and GIZ, the embedded TA which brought with it a large body of experience in these approaches and the character and quality of the national CBUs. Clearly strong leadership from a regional Project Manager would have been a big asset in the early stages of the project because this would be an area where the project was vulnerable to political capture at the national level for the financing of non-project related activities (for the avoidance of doubt this was not the case).

Lesson 4: Donor coordination is important.

181. It also appears to be incredibly elusive. The challenge presented by land degradation in the region is much larger than the vanity of any one donor organisation. However, we see repeatedly projects designed with the intention of fixing "*the whole thing*". A typical example will include addressing the enabling environment, capacity building, demonstration projects and mainstreaming the experience in just a few years. Yet we never stop to consider that the "problem" has been many decades if not centuries in the making. To avoid any misunderstanding the MCB project was not trying to fix the whole thing, indeed it was targeting a component of a wider sub-set of issues. Projects are small-scale, time bound and the more focused they are the more likely the chance of success. The problem is large-scale, continuous and extremely complex. Building a coalition of donors and coordinating the different parts to be addressed while pooling the intellectual capacities to think about the problem is probably the only way we can achieve the sorts of economy of scale to address land degradation in its entirety. The FE believes that the MCB demonstrated this (as a "work in progress") despite the challenges it has faced.

Annexes

Annex 1 Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation

Project Title: CACILM: Multi-country capacity building project

Functional Title: International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

Duration: Estimated 30 working days during the period of: November-December 2012

Terms of Payment: Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report

Duty station: Travel to all five Central Asian countries

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *CACILM Multi-country capacity building project* (PIMS 3790).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	CACILM Multi-country Capacity Building Project			
GEF Project ID:	3231		<i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$)	<i>at completion</i> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	3790	GEF financing:	USD 2,865,000	
Country:	Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan	IA/EA own:	UNDP USD 1,961,500	
Region:	Central Asia	Government :	Government of Kyrgyzstan USD 150,000; Government of Kazakhstan USD 100,000, Government of Turkmenistan USD 100,000, Government of Tajikistan USD 100,000, Government of Uzbekistan USD 100,000	
Focal Area:	LD	Other:	GIZ USD 500,000, GM USD 300,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP 15/SP SLM 2	Total co-financing:	3,311,500	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	USD 6,176,500	
Other Partners involved:	GIZ, GM	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		10 December 2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31.12.2012	Actual: April 2013

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the 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.

Terminal Evaluations (TE) are intended to provide an objective and independent assessment of project implementation and impact, including achievement of global environmental benefits and lessons learned to guide future SLM efforts. Specifically, the TE will assess the extent to which the planned project outcomes and outputs have been achieved, as well as assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project as defined in the guidelines for Terminal Evaluations.

The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy. The evaluation covers the entire project including non-GEF financed components. The particular objectives are:

- (i) To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, project's Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and GEF Increment, and other related documents⁷⁶;
- (ii) To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
- (iii) To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;
- (iv) To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
- (v) To recommend the project in improving/updating its Outcomes' indicators;
- (vi) To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
- (vii) To assess the sustainability of the project's interventions;
- (viii) To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management⁷⁷;
- (ix) To assess project relevance to national priorities (including achieving gender equality goals);

The main stakeholders of the evaluation are: UNDP Country Offices in Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, GIZ, GM, governments of the Central Asian countries, and the UNDP/GEF Regional Center for Europe and CIS (Bratislava).

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the projects impact and relevance in regard to the objectives of the GEF Land Degradation focal area, and to learn lessons regarding the design and implementation of future similar projects.

Project background

The GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM: Multi-country capacity building project was approved by GEF in 2009. The inception workshop was organized in March 2010. The project is a 3 year SLM capacity building project being implemented in 5 Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). The project officially commenced in January 2010 and will terminate in December 2012.

The project is financed by the global environment facility (GEF) through its operational program for land degradation, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the German agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) GmbH, and the Global Mechanism of the UNCCD (GM). The project is directly executed (DEX) by UNDP CO in 5 Central Asian countries where UNDP CO Kyrgyzstan is a principal office. In GEF terminology it is a "full-size" project i.e. it has a contribution from GEF exceeding USD 1 million. The total project is valued at USD 6,176,500 of which GEF financing is USD 2,865,000 with following in kind/cash contributions:

government of Kyrgyzstan USD 150,000

⁷⁶ Such as UNDP KGZ Country Gender Mainstreaming Strategy

⁷⁷ Including achieving gender equality goals, setting gender-sensitive indicators and ensuring gender balance among the project's beneficiaries and target groups

government of Kazakhstan USD 100,000
government of Turkmenistan USD 100,000
government of Tajikistan USD100,000
government of Uzbekistan USD 100,000
UNDP USD 1,961,500
GIZ USD 500,000
GM USD 300,000

The project is an integrated multi-country initiative within the CACILM CPP and is one of four related multi-country support projects under the CACILM Multi-country Framework Project (CMPF) by contributing the system, institutional, and individual capacities needed to respond to country barriers in terms of an inconsistent and divergent policy environment, inadequate and inefficient resources to combat SLM, gaps in human capital to develop SLM programs, and a disconnect between project level successes and policy making. The project builds upon the structure created by the CMPF and supports the CACILM CPP effort to catalyze efforts to reverse land degradation processes and improve sustainable livelihoods through a consolidated approach put in place by the five Central Asian Countries and Strategic Partnership Agreement members (UNDP, ADB, GIZ, GM, ICARDA, and FAO) with Global Environment Facility (GEF) support. Building on this framework and consistent with the overall CMPF vision to enhance "the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD".

The **goal** of this project is *the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD*. The project **objective** is *to increase capacity at the national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming Framework*.

The project supports the CACs efforts to halt land degradation by enhancing the capability of each nation to execute their National Programming Frameworks. GEF support will result in (a) increased policy coherence; (b) resources effectively mobilized for SLM; (c) improved interaction between state agencies and land users through increased human resources; and (d) developed and strengthened learning, dissemination, and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM. Without this component project, the established multi-country and national support structures will not have the capacity for effective policy-making, planning, and financing SLM initiatives that will meet future challenges and changing land-use scenarios with new global challenges, such as the effects of global warming on agriculture and food systems.

The project is designed to produce four **outcomes**:

Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.

Outcome 1 responds to the policy gaps and to the need for mainstreaming policies on land degradation and how and what type of incentives is available for production processes, funding available for SLM, and finally, the inclusiveness of policies. Outcome 1 was designed to enhance policy coherence by providing the conditions and capacities that will enable the effective review of the policy framework and to the development of tangible recommendations for policy actions at the national and multi-country levels. It was planned that the existing CACILM structure will be the beneficiary of system-level organizational development activities that will make it a more effective and sustainable forum for bringing together diverse agencies for the purpose of guiding the NPF. The

outputs to support Outcome 1 provide for an enabling multi-country agreement, an articulated methodology and tools to analyze and improve policy coherence at the national level. Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 1.1: A strengthened inter-governmental structure to support SLM

Output 1.2: Fortified CACILM national-level structures and mechanism to support policy development and mainstreaming.

Output 1.3. Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing:

Output 1.4: Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies:

Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements.

This outcome was deemed to establish an effective baseline and benchmarks for SLM financing and develop the organic capacities to mobilize resources in support of SLM. The outcome builds-off an initial introduction to the *Developing Integrated Financing Strategies Initiative* (DIFS), initiated by the Global Mechanism, and seeks to catalyze a capacity enhancement and knowledge exchange process that results in establishing a core national team comprised of relevant governmental and civil society stakeholders enabled for developing an Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS). Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

Output 2.1 – Five national multi-stakeholder working groups are established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing IFSs

Output 2.2 – Five Integrated Financing Strategies drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.

Output 2.3: Five SLM Investment Programs Developed:

Output 2.4: Five National Integrated Financing Strategies approved for implementation

Outcome 3: Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through human resource development.

Outcome 3 responds to the need for a collaborative approach by increasing the system, institutional and individual capacities to implement a multi-stakeholder management process within the "integrated area-based approach." This will be realized through an increase in the capacity for collaborative SLM by improving the interaction, communication, and coordination between state agencies, land users, and other principal stakeholders at the local and national levels. This exchange will increase the local inputs into policy-making and improvements to the legal framework while lending higher visibility of the concerns of the actors at the local level. Outcome 3 emphasizes both short-term interventions in establishing the basis for collaborative resource management, through training and events while developing long-term frameworks in the form of capacity building strategies and action plans oriented to specific stakeholder groups. The specific outputs are:

Output 3.1: A national-level, long-term SLM Capacity Building Program approved by NCC.

Output 3.2: Approved Mechanisms for enhanced communication and coordination between state agencies and land users.

Output 3.3: Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.

Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened.

This outcome is designed to be fully complementary to the CACILM SLM Knowledge Network (CKN), under the auspices of the CACILM Knowledge Management Project (SLM-KM). The learning networks, events, tools, and strategies established within this outcome provide a forum for

horizontal and vertical integration that enable participants to partake in blended learning and in face-to-face events at the national-level. These will complement the information presented in the multi-country web-based CACILM Knowledge Network. The national learning events will provide an opportunity to provide the CKN with enhanced levels of promotion that are essential in engaging members from an extensive base of ground-level networks capable of feeding new learning products into the CKN communication channels.

The development of learning networks on national level that connect decision-makers with the grass roots experiences in combating land degradation and that enable an effective horizontal and vertical exchange of leaning at the national-level. These networks will focus on personal and face-to-face interaction in a way that reaches the majority of the stakeholders, many of whom do not have access to computers or electronic networks.

The development of interactive learning events, products, and tools that provide for the level of interaction required for a truly interactive multi-stakeholder community. The key outputs will include:

Output 4.1: National Learning Networks on best practices in collaborative SLM established and functioning.

Output 4.2 Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders.

Output 4.3: Effective system of upscaling and replication of good practices in collaborative SLM on national and regional level established and functional.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method⁷⁸ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has been developed over the time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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 the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNCCD National Focal Points, CACILM NSEC (where available), UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to **all five Central Asian countries**. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- UNDP Country Offices;
- MCB Project Team in each country (project staff consisting of UNDP, GIZ, GM and CIM-financed team members);
- UNCCD Focal Points;
- GEF FP;
- CACILM NSec (where applicable);
- GIZ (at least: CTA of the project, Regional Program on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in Central Asia)
- GM representatives;

⁷⁸ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), 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 obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

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

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	0,39	0,2					0,39	0,2
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			0,6	0,65			0,6	0,65
• Other					0,5		0,5	
Totals	0,39	0,2	0,6	0,65	0,5		1,49	0,85

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.⁷⁹

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation (desk review)	3 days	<i>November 15 , 2012</i>
Evaluation Mission (in-country field visits, interviews)	19 days (3 days per country and 3 days debriefing and discussions in KGZ)	<i>December 04 , 2012</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	<i>December 09 , 2012</i>
Final Report	3 days	<i>December 12 , 2012</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and RPMU

⁷⁹ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

	and method	mission.	
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, GIZ and GM, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP, GIZ and GM comments on the draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international and 1 national evaluator*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international Consultant will be a team leader and bear responsibility over submission of final report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

International evaluator

- Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences;
- Minimum 10 years of professional experience in the fields of Sustainable Land Management;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
- Previous working experience in the environmental field in the Central Asian region;
- Knowledge of the Central Asian Countries Initiative on Land Management in Central Asia (CACILM)
- Excellent English communication skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset;

National consultant

- Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences;
- Minimum 5 years of professional experience in the fields of Sustainable Land Management;
- Basic knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Excellent English and Russian communication skills;

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

Annex 2 Itinerary List of Meetings & People Met

Time	Activity	Participants	Responsible person	confirmation
Thursday, 29 November, 2012				
09:00 – 09:30	Security briefing	Jan, Torobek	Dinara	confirmed
09:40 – 12:00	Meeting with MCB team in Kyrgyzstan	Gulmira, Kathrin, Dinara	Gulmira	confirmed
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch			
13:30 – 14:30	Meeting with GIZ colleagues	R. Bodemeyer, Ilka Starrost	Firdavs	
14:50 – 15:50	Meeting with CAMP Alatoo	Janyl Kojomuratova Azamat Isakov	Gulmira	confirmed
16:00-16:20	Meeting with UNCCD Focal Point	Nurlan Duisheev Taalai Sydykov	Gulmira	confirmed
16:20-17:00	Briefing in UNDP Kyrgyzstan CO	UNDP CO / Pradeep Sharma, Daniar, Kumar	Firdavs	confirmed
Friday, 30 November, 2012				
10:00-10:40	Meeting with Parliament member	Esengul Isakov	Gulmira	
11:00 – 11:40	Meeting with Pasture Department	Abdymalik Egemberdiev Kubat Kudaibergenov	Gulmira	confirmed
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch			
13:20-13:50	Meeting with GM	Kanat Sultanaliev	Firdavs	Might be on travel
14:00 – 14:40	Meeting with IFS Consultants	Sulaiman Berdikeev Bakyt Satybekov Talan Sydykbaev	Gulmira	confirmed
15:00 – 15:40	Meeting with Agrolead and Forest Association	Yelena Chigibayeva, Aitkul Burhanov	Gulmira	confirmed
16:00 – 16:40	Meeting with UNDP projects Association	Baibek Usubaliev Gulnara Abdykalykova	Gulmira	confirmed
December 01, 2012				
09:00 – 11:00	Meeting with RPMU	Firdavs and Ilka	Firdavs	
11:00 – 17:00	Desk review			
December 02, 2012				
09:00-17:00	desk review and report writing			

December 03, 2012			
09:00-11:00	Meeting with Firdavs and Ilka		
11:10	Departure to Dushanbe		
Time	Activity	Participants	Responsible person
Sunday, 02 December, 2012			
	Arrival to Dushanbe	Francis Hurst	Firuz
Monday, 03 December, 2012			
09:00-10:30	Meeting with MCB team in Tajikistan	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
10:40-11:00	Meeting with UNDP E&E Programme Manager	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
11:20-12:00	Meeting with Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov, UNDP Tajikistan ARR/Programme and Nargizakhon Usmanova UNDP EE Programme analyst.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva Khurshed Kholov	Firuz
12:20-13:20	Lunch	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
13:40-14:00	Meeting with UNCCD reporting Secretary, First Vice Chairman, Mr. Nazirov Khikmatullo	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
14:50-15:20	Meeting with vice chairman of the Ministry of Agriculture, Mr. Isroilov Sijoudin	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
15:30-16:00	Meeting with Chairman of the State agency for Forestry and Hunting, Mr. Ismatov Azizullo and Deputy Director Madibron Saidov.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
16:00-16:30	Meeting with the Director of Research Institute of Livestock breeding, Mr. Ikromov A.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
Tuesday, 04 December, 2012			
09:00 – 09:30	Meeting with the Government of Tajikistan. Mr. Ziyoratsho Sadullo, author of the draft of the law on pastures, member of Parliament of Tajikistan, Mr. Vatanov M, Head of Committee for Legislation and Human Rights, Parliament of Tajikistan. Mr. Khursandmurod Mirzoev, Senior Legal Adviser to the President of Tajikistan.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
09:40 – 12:00	Meeting with Tajik Agrarian University, Deputy rector and other personnel of Soil Dept.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch		
13:30 – 14:30	Meeting GIZ forest sector reform project. Ms. Roziya Kirgizbekova and Heino Hertel.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
14:50 – 15:50	Meeting with ADB, Rural Development project. Pasture, forest and arable land project. Sharofjon Rakhimov, Sabzov Usmon.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
16:00-16:30	Meeting with IFS Team, Ms. Farida Muminova, Davlatali Elnazarov and Murod Ergashev.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz

Wednesday, 05 December, 2012			
09:00-09:40	Meeting with Jamoat Resource Centers. Ms. Gulshan Karimova (JRC Sabo), Umarali Abdulov (Khonakoi Kuhi), Abdughani Haitov (JRC Rabot), Kuvat Murodov (JRC Romit).	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
10:00-12:00	Round Table with participation of project consultants. Bakhtiyor Razykov consultant on SLM best practices, Madaminov Abdullo, consultant on changing learning curriculum, Shavkat Bozorov, consultant on improving inter-ministerial coordination and communication, Mr. Shodibek Kurbonov, Expert on Protected Areas and Forestry, Ubaidullo Akramov, Consultant on management planning and community mobilization.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
12:00-13:00	Lunch	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
13:30-16:00	Desk work and review of the final evaluation with CACILM MCB project coordinator.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
16:00 – 18:00	Debriefing of final evaluation mission and preliminary report. Participants: UNDP Tajikistan CO representatives. EEP personnel Representatives of the State agency for forestry and Hunting. Representatives of Committee for Environmental Protection. Parliament of Tajikistan NGOs Other project partners.	Francis Hurst Maya Eralieva	Firuz
Thursday, 06 December, 2012			
Departure to Astana			
Time	Activity	Participants	Responsible person
Thursday, 06 December, 2012			
	Arrival to Astana	Francis Hurst	Snezhanna
10:30-13:00	Primary meeting with MCB team in Kazakhstan	Yerlan, Snezhanna	Yerlan
13:00-14:00	Lunch		
14:10-16:00	Meeting with UNCCD FP	Mr. Bolat Bekniyaz	Yerlan
16:30-18:00	Meeting at the CO UNDP Kazakhstan	Mr. Stanislav Kim Ms. Victoria Baigazina	Yerlan
Friday, 07 December, 2012			

09:30 – 10:30	Meeting at the Forestry and Hunting Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture	Mr. Kairat Ustemirov	
10:50 – 12:00	Meeting at the Ministry of Environmental Protection	Ms. Saule Zhurynova	
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch		
14:00 – 15:00	Meeting with NGO "Union Farmers of Kazakhstan"	Mr. Akzhol Abdulalimov	
15:30 – 16:00	Debriefing with MCB team		
16:00-18:00	Desk review		
Saturday, 08 December, 2012			
09:00-17:00	Meeting with MCB team Desk review		
Sunday, 09 December, 2012			
Departure to Tashkent			
Time	Action, Venue	Participants	Responsible / Comments
December 09, Sunday Arrive Tashkent			
	Arrival of Mr. Francis Hurst in Tashkent		Mr. Maruf Abdukadirov
December 10, Monday			
09:00-11:00	Meeting with MCB National team, MCB office	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Natalya Shulgina Ms. Maricla Costa Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov Mr. Maruf Abdukadirov	F.Salakhuddinov

11:00-12:00	Meeting with CACILM NSEC team, NSEC office	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Raisa Taryannikova, Head of CACILM National Secretariat Ms. Gulchehra Khasankhanova, Project monitoring Specialist, CACILM NSEC	N. Shulgina, F.Salakhuddinov
12:30-14:00	Lunch		
14:30-15:30	Meeting with representative of GIZ "Pasture Management" project	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Ute Fischer-Zuykov, Project Manager	M.Karimova
16:00-17:00	Time reserved for meeting at UNDP CO	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Mr. Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov – Head of EEU	D.Abotalipov
17:00-18:00	Working in the MCB project office	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Natalya Shulgina Ms. Maricla Costa Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov	F.Salakhuddinov
December 11, Tuesday			
09:30 – 10:30	Meeting with representative of the Ministry of Economy	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Mr. Bakhretdin Muradov Member of CACILM NCC	N.Shulgina, F.Salakhuddinov

10:30-11:30	Meeting with representative of the State Committee for Nature Protection,	Mr. Francis Hurst , International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov , National consultant Ms. Honiya Asilbekova – Head of Information Department	F.Salakhuddinov
11:30-12:30	Meeting with Representative of the State Committee for Land Resources, geodesy, cartography and state cadastre	Mr. Francis Hurst , International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov , National consultant Mr. Shukhrat Bobomuradov – Head of Department	F.Salakhuddinov
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch		
14:30 – 15:30	Meeting with representative of the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources	Mr. Francis Hurst , International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov , National consultant Mr. Umid Abdullaev – Director of UZGIP Institute	N.Shulgina
16:00-17:00	Meeting with UNCCD National Focal Point, Uzhydromet (TBA)	Mr. Francis Hurst , International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov , National consultant Mr. Bakhtiyor Kadyrov , Deputy General Director, CACILM NCC member, National Focal Point of UNCCD	N. Shulgina, F.Salakhuddinov
17:00-18:00	Meeting with representative of the National University of Uzbekistan	Mr. Francis Hurst , International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov , National consultant Ms. L.Gafurova - Head of the AgroEcoBiological center under the National University of Uzbekistan	F.Salakhuddinov
December 12, Wednesday			

09:00-10:00	Meeting with representatives of UNDP/GEF project on “Achieving Ecosystem Stability on Degraded Land in Karakalpakstan and Kyzylkum Desert”	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Irina Bekmirzaeva, Project Manager Mr. Umid Nazarkulov, National Project Coordinator	U.Nazarkulov
10:00-11:00	Meeting with representative of the Republican Center for Decorative Gardening and Forestry	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Mr. Muradbay Ganiev, General Director of the Center	N. Shulgina, F.Salakhuddinov
11:00 -12:00	Meeting with GEF SGP in Uzbekistan	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant Mr. Aleksey Volkov – National Coordinator of GEF SGP in Uzbekistan	N.Shulgina
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch		
14:00-15:30	Working in the MCB project office	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Natalya Shulgina Ms. Maricla Costa Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov	F.Salakhuddinov

16:00 – 17:00	Debriefing meeting at UNDP CO (TBA)	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Mr. Abduvakkos Abdurahmanov – Head of EEU Ms. Natalya Shulgina Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov	N. Shulgina,
17:00 – 18:00	Debriefing meeting with MCB Project staff	Mr. Francis Hurst, International consultant, Mr. Tulkin Radjabov, National consultant Ms. Natalya Shulgina, NCBC Mr. Fayzulla Salakhuddinov, NTA Ms. Maricla Costa, Mr. Mafur Abdukadirov, AFA	F.Salakhuddinov
December 13, Thursday			
	Departure of Mr. Francis Hurst from Tashkent airport		Mr. Maruf Abdukadirov
Thursday 13 December, 2012			
09:00	Arrive Almaty		
17.00	Meeting with Turkmenistan PMU, MCB NC Mr. Sultan Weisov		
Friday, 14 December, 2012			
All day	Discussions with country PMUs, UN CO, Kumar, preparation for wrap up meeting		
Saturday 15 December, 2012			
All day	PSC meeting		
19.00	Meeting with Dr. Durikov Muhammet National Focal Point UNCCD, Turkmenistan	Francis	
Sunday 16 December, 2012			
All day	Return by road to Bishkek		
Monday 17 December, 2012			
All day	Wrap up meetings with RPMU, UNDP CO, RR	Firdavs, Francis,	

		Maya	
Tuesday 19 December, 2012			
All day	Depart Bishkek return to homebase	Francis	

Annex 3 Documents Reviewed

PDFA

Project Document

Inception Report

Mid Term Evaluation

PIMS

Project Quarterly Reports

APR/PIR

Annex 4 Country LFMs & Results

GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM CPP: Multi-country Capacity Building Project.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT (KAZAKHSTAN)

Goal	The restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD.					
Цель проекта	Повышение потенциала на национальном международном уровне с целью развития и реализации интегрированного подхода и стратегий по борьбе с деградацией земельных ресурсов в рамках операционной национальной рамочной программы.					
Objectives/ Outcomes Результат	Indicator Индикатор	Baseline Базовая линия	Target Value (of the indicator)	Target Цель	Sources of verification Источники проверки	Progress
Project Objective: Increase capacity at the national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming	1.1.1. Degree of independent development and quality of national reports of the UNCCD.	1.1.1. UNCCD Focal point needs support to properly promote UNCCD implementation.	1.1.1. The national reporting on the UNCCD implementation is independently prepared by the UNCCD Focal Point and is of acceptable quality.	1.1.1. The capacities of the UNCCD Focal Point to plan, implement and reporting directly related to the implementation of the UNCCD are strengthened through Q12.	Minutes of meetings with the UNCCD Focal Point.	The national governmental structures actively support UNCCD Focal Point. UNCCD Focal Point has prepared a book on combat desertification. Independently involved in writing the fourth national report.
	1.1.2. Amount and quality of capacity	1.1.2. The national UNCCD Working	1.1.2. At least two targeted capacity	1.1.2. The national UNCCD Working Group	Minutes of the meetings with the	Members of the UNCCD Working Group

<p>Framework⁸⁰.</p> <p>Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.</p> <p>Результат 1: Совершенствована последовательная политика через активизации принципов УУЗР в национальной политике и законодательстве с целью достижения синергизма с другими экологическими</p>	building support which members of the national UNCCD Working Group receive.	Group lacks essential information and capacities regarding GEF in general and GEF5 processes particularly.	building events are conducted for the national UNCCD Working Group members per year (trainings, study tours, etc.).	meets regularly, discusses relevant issues of SLM with impact orientation and represents most important stakeholders for promoting UNCCD implementation.	UNCCD Working Group and other documentation of the events conducted.	increased their capacity through participation in the learning events under the MCB project as well as within other projects.
	1.1.3. Level of participation of the UNCCD Working Group and/or other key stakeholders responsible for promoting SLM in MCB project activities.	1.1.3. No MCB project activities before the project start.	1.1.3. The UNCCD Working Group and/or other key stakeholders responsible for promoting SLM are aware of and actively participate in MCB project activities.	1.1.3. Good coordination and working relationship with the members of the UNCCD Working Group and other key stakeholders responsible for SLM in Kazakhstan through Q12.	1.1.3. Written communication, minutes from MCB project activities.	Key stakeholders responsible for SLM and implementation of the UNCCD in Kazakhstan were actively involved into the project planning and implementation.
	1.1.4 Quantity and quality of integration of SLM principles and approaches in the revised UNCCD NAP for Kazakhstan.	1.1.4. Use of synergies with other Rio-conventions insufficient and SLM data and approaches partly out-dated.	1.1.4. The revised UNCCD NAP, IFS and IIF include SLM principles, approaches, project concepts and activities to use synergies with other relevant environmental	1.1.4. SLM principles, approaches, project concepts and activities are properly included into the revised UNCCD NAP in Kazakhstan by Q11.	1.1.4. Commented revised UNCCD NAP of Kazakhstan.	SLM principles and activities are properly included into the project document “NAP Alignment and UNCCD Reporting and Review Process UNCCD NAP in Kazakhstan”.

⁸⁰ Or other national strategic documents in support in the implementation of the UNCCD

<p>многосторонними соглашениями.</p> <p>Output 1.1: Existing national structures for mainstreaming SLM into policy and legislation are strengthened</p> <p>Результат 1.1. Усилены действующие национальные структуры по внедрению принципов УУЗР в стратегии и законодательство</p>			<p>conventions and integrates properly SLM principles and most important issues for the country.</p>			
<p>Output 1.2: Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing⁸¹.</p>	<p>1.2.1. Degree of inclusion of SLM principles into the multispectral government programs.</p>	<p>1.2.1. The SLM principles not sufficiently integrated in the “Green development” program.</p>	<p>1.2.1. The “Green development” program is updated and includes most important SLM principles as integrated part.</p>	<p>1.2.1. SLM principles are included into inter-sectoral government program “Green Development” (“Zhasyl Damu”) by Q9.</p> <p>1.2.1. УУЗР принципы включены в много</p>	<p>1.2.1. Revised inter-sectoral government program “Green development” program.</p>	<p>SLM activities are included into inter-sectoral government program “Green Development”. Moreover, upon the request from Livestock Department of MA,</p>

⁸¹ Link to Outcome 2

				отраслевую правительственную программу «Зеленое развитие» к 9 Кв.		the government programme on mobile livestock was developed.
	1.2.2. Existence and quality of a draft concept of a pasture law for Kazakhstan.	1.2.2. No pasture law exists in Kazakhstan.	1.2.2. Recommendations for legislation on threngening sustainable pasture management for Kazakhstan, is elaborated and submitted to respective State agency by Q10. 1.2.2. Рекомендации по усилению законодательства для устойчивого управления пастбищами в Казахстане разработаны и предоставлены соответствующим гос. органам к 10 Кв.	1.2.2. Recommendations for legislation on threngening of sustainable pasture management for Kazakhstan, is elaborated and submitted to respective State agency by Q10. 1.2.2. Рекомендации по усилению законодательства для устойчивого управления пастбищами в Казахстане разработаны и предоставлены соответствующим гос. органам к 10 Кв.	1.2.2. Recommendations for legislation on threngening of sustainable pasture management. Minutes of the respective meeting of and discussion with the national UNCCD Working Group.	The draft of Pasture law was developed and submitted to a high political level. At the moment the law is discussed in the Parliament jointly with the Government
Output 1.3: Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives	1.3.1. Level of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies,	1.3.1. Awareness on collaborative SLM approaches within governmental	1.3.1. Awareness (and its change during the project phase) of key representatives of	1.3.1. High level (>75%) of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies	1.3.1. Results of awareness surveys at the national levels undertaken	Survey was not conducted.

and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies.	which demonstrate awareness.	structures in CA countries is low.	state level agencies on SLM is measured by Q12.	demonstrate awareness by Q12.	twice, at Q8 and Q12.	
	1.3.2 Quantity, quality and accessibility of thematic background materials on different thematic topics of SLM.	1.3.2. Information materials available are not sufficient to provide flexible and demand-driven SLM-related advisory and training support for decision makers and other relevant stakeholders.	1.3.2 Background information materials on different thematic topics of SLM are available and accessible for the MCB national coordination unit, national UNCCD working group members to support advisory services.	1.3.2. Information materials and knowledge building activities were developed responding to the needs of decision-makers on national level through Q12. 1.3.2. Информационные материалы и мероприятия по повышению осведомленности разработаны на основе потребностей лиц, принимающих решения на национальном уровне к K12.	1.3.2. Information materials developed.	Information materials (books, press releases, articles in publications, brochures) have been published and actively disseminated through various resources, with the support of other international projects and organizations.
Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM are not defined.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM are known and included into IFS.	2.1.1. The baseline of financial flows to SLM is determined. 2.1.1. Определена базовая линия финансовых потоков в области УУЗР	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 as included into IFS.	The baseline of financial flows to SLM is determined.
	2.1.2. The amount of	2.1.2. No Integrated	2.1.2. National	2.1.2. Increase in	2.1.2. Published	

Output 2.1. National multi-stakeholder working group is established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing IFSs.	new national funding commitments for SLM.	Financing Strategies exist in CA countries.	funding commitments for SLM exceed baseline yr. financial flows by 15%.	baseline financial flows by 15% by Q12.	reports and confirmation on new and additional financial flows to SLM.	
	2.1.3. Availability of adapted IFS training module for conducting National DIFS workshop.	2.1.3. IFS training module is not adapted for Kazakhstan conditions.	2.1.3 IFS training module is adapted to Kazakh conditions.	2.1.3. The training module for IFS is adapted. 2.1.3. Тренинговый модуль по ИФС адаптирован.	2.1.3. Minutes of the National DIFS workshop.	The training module for IFS is adapted to Kazakh conditions.
	2.1.4. The number of persons qualified to develop IFS.	2.1.4. No qualified persons to develop IFS.	2.1.4 At least 30 persons trained on IFS methodology.	2.1.4. At least 30 persons trained in IFS methodology by Q8. 2.1.4. Как минимум 30 человек обучены методологии ИФС к К8.	2.1.4. Minutes of the National DIFS workshop.	National Training DIFS Workshop held for 34 national stakeholders.
Output 2.2. Integrated Financing Strategy drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.	2.2.1 Status of development and submission for approval of the IFS for Kazakhstan.	2.2.1. No IFS for Kazakhstan in place.	2.2.1. The IFS for Kazakhstan developed and submitted for approval by appropriate national authorities.	2.2.1. Approved IFS and IIF are included into the inter-sectoral government program "Green Development" ("Zhasyl Damu") by Q10. 2.2.1. IFS и ИП одобрена и включена в много-отраслевую программу «Зеленое развитие» к 10 Кв.	2.2.1. Minutes of the meetings with the appropriate national authorities.	Needed support of the appropriate national authorities for IFS development is provided.
Output 2.3 SLM	2.3.1. Contents, volume	2.3.1. No SLM	2.3.1. The Integrated	2.3.1. UNCCD Focal Point	2.3.1. Integrated	Members of national

Integrated Investment Frameworks Developed.	and status of agreement with responsible governmental bodies of developed portfolio of synergetic project concepts as part of the National Integrated Investment Framework.	Investment Program responding with Integrated Financing Strategy developed.	Investment Framework developed in accordance with Integrated Financing Strategy.	and members of UNCCD Working Group are using IIF as the background for financing and capacity building activities by Q10.	Investment Program.	IFS task groups remain in the task groups during development of Integrated Investment Frameworks and the project concepts.
Output 2.4: National SLM investment projects developed and submitted for financing Результат 2.4. Национальные инвестиционные проекты по УУЗР представлены для финансирования.	2.4.1. Number of project concepts developed on the basis of Integrated Investment Framework and submitted for financing.	2.3.1. No Integrated Investment Framework in place.	2.3.1. At least 2 project concepts developed on the basis of the Integrated Investment Framework.	2.4.1. At least 2 project concepts developed on the basis of Integrated Investment Framework and submitted for financing by Q12.	2.4.1. Project concepts relevant for SLM in the country.	Developed and submitted for funding to the GEF project proposal on NAP Alignment and UNCCD Reporting (budget \$150000). The USAID project "Improving the Climate Resilience of Kazakhstan Wheat and Central Asian Food Security" was launched (budget \$ 1 mln).
Outcome 3: Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through	3.1.1. Existence of a national CBU in Kazakhstan	3.1.1. No Kazakhstan National CBU exists by Q1.	3.1.1. Kazakhstan National CBU established with the national project team	3.1.1. Capacity building unit established by Q3.	3.1.1. Reports of the Kazakhstan National CBU.	UNCCD Focal Point and related State agencies supported the MCB project.

<p>human resource development</p> <p>Результат 3: Взаимодействие между государственными органами и землепользователям и повышено через развитие человеческих ресурсов.</p> <p>Output 3.1. A short-term Capacity Building Program for selected stakeholders responsible for interaction between state agencies and land users developed and long-term priorities for Capacity Building integrated into revised UNCCD NAP.</p>			and involved experts.	3.1.1. Группа реализации проекта создана		
	3.1.2 Existence of a national short-term Capacity Building Action Plan.	3.1.2. No National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders is available.	3.1.2. Developed SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan to be implemented by Q8.	3.1.2. A short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders is developed by Q8. 3.1.2. Краткосрочный План работы по созданию потенциала для заинтересованных сторон в УУЗР разработан к 8 кв.	3.1.2. Published SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan.	A short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders is developed.
	3.1.3. Quantity and quality of implemented actions as planned under the short-term Capacity Building Action Plan.	3.1.3. A short term capacity building action plan is not in place.	3.1.3. At least 5 capacity building measures have been implemented and evaluation feedback by participants was positive.	3.1.3. The short-term Capacity Building Action Plans for SLM stakeholders implemented through Q12. 3.1.3. Краткосрочный План работы по созданию потенциала для заинтересованных сторон в УУЗР реализован к 12 кв.	3.1.3. Documentation of conducted capacity building measures and analysis of evaluation results as provided by the participants.	National State organizations and NGOs are interested in recommendations for capacity building and actively participate in Capacity Building activities.

	3.1.4 Extent of inclusion of national strategic directions on capacity building for SLM into the revised UNCCD NAP of Kazakhstan.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building priorities not integrated into National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building strategic directions and priorities are integrated into the National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. Long-term Capacity Building Priorities integrated into the revised National Action Plan to Combat Desertification (alignment to 10 th year strategy of the UNCCD) by Q12. 3.1.4. Долгосрочные приоритеты по созданию потенциала интегрированы в пересмотренный национальный План действий по борьбе с опустыниванием (в соответствии с 10 летней стратегией КБО ООН) к 12 кв.	3.1.4. Published National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	UNCCD Focal Point and related State agencies support long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.
Output 3.2. Mechanisms for communication and coordination between state organizations and land users are enhanced Результат 3.2. Механизмы по	3.2.1 Availability of concrete recommendations to improve communication and cooperation between responsible State agencies.	3.2.1. No draft of the Communication and coordination action plan in place.	3.2.1. Main mechanisms for improved communication and coordination between selected relevant State organizations are developed and discussed.	3.2.1. A Communication and coordination action plan to improve communication and coordination between responsible State agencies developed by Q8.	3.2.1. Drafted Communication and coordination action plan. Minutes of meetings to discuss and agree the plan.	UNCCD Focal Point and related State agencies supported Communication and coordination action plan.
	3.2.2. Degree of	3.2.2. Very weak	3.2.2 Main	3.2.2. A Communication	3.2.2. Minutes of	Mechanism of

коммуникации и координации между гос. органами и землепользователям и усилены	integration of identified needs for improvement of the communication and cooperation between selected state agencies and land user groups into the revised UNCCD NAP.	integration in current UNCCD NAP.	recommendations for the improvement of the communication and cooperation between selected state agencies and land user groups are included into the revised UNCCD NAP.	and coordination action plan agreed by UNCCD working group meeting and implementation started by Q9.	the MCB Project activities. Minutes of the meetings with stakeholders.	interaction between the highest political level (President) and the representatives of small and medium-sized farms (Farmers Union) has been successfully tested.
Output 3.3. Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.	3.3.1 Number of persons trained on thematic topics of collaborative SLM.	3.3.1. No systematic trainings in improved Collaborative SLM modules, practices and principles available.	3.3.1. At least 200 representatives of selected state agencies and land users receive and use knowledge on SLM.	3.3.1. At least 200 persons trained using at least 2 modular training programmes by Q12. 3.3.1. Не менее 200 чел. обучены в не менее 2 модульных тренинговых программах к 12 кв.	3.3.1. Records of participants. Training certificates issued.	At least 500 persons trained on thematic topics of collaborative SLM at least 5 modular training programmes.
	3.3.2 Number of trainers trained on thematic topics of collaborative SLM.	3.3.2. Limited number of trainers for SLM available.	3.3.2. At least 10 trainers are trained on SLM relevant topics.	3.3.2. At least 10 trainers are trained by Q12. 3.3.2. Не менее 10 тренеров обучены к 12 кв.	3.3.2. Records of participants. Training certificates issued.	At least 20 trainers are trained on SLM relevant topics.
Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM	4.1.1. Number of the national level learning and consultative activities for promoting	4.1.1. Not enough national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best	4.1.1 At least one exchange and consultative activity with a diverse group of relevant	4.1.1. The outreach to stakeholders relevant for SLM in Kazakhstan in the frame of Knowledge Management is assured	4.1.1. Minutes and records of participants of national level learning and	Stakeholders supported national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM

<p>developed and strengthened.</p> <p>Output 4.1. Stakeholders relevant for SLM actively exchange thematic information and experiences</p> <p>Результат 4.1. Заинтересованные стороны в области УУЗР активно обмениваются тематической информацией и опытом</p>	SLM best practices.	practices.	stakeholders is conducted.	<p>through Q12.</p> <p>4.1.1. Охват заинтересованных сторон по УУЗР в Казахстане, в рамках управления знаниями обеспечено в 7-12 кв.</p>	consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	best practices.
<p>Output 4.2. Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders.</p>	4.2.1. Number of best practices documented at national level.	4.2.1. Best practices are not captured and documented at national level.	4.2.1 At least 18 best and good practices on SLM are documented for dissemination.	<p>4.2.1. At least 3 best and at least 15 good practices on SLM identified, documented and disseminated by Q12.</p> <p>4.2.1. Не менее 3 наилучших и не менее 15 хороших практик по</p>	4.2.1. Documentations of best practices under WOCAT standard; other best practice documentations (information flyers; publications...); dissemination strategy and report	At least 18 best and good practices on SLM are documented for dissemination.

				УУЗР выявлено, задокументировано и распространено к 12 кв.	on its implementation	
	4.2.2. Existence and quality of a dissemination strategy for the identified best practices at national level.	4.2.2. No systemic documentation of best practices and, hence, dissemination plans available.	4.2.2 A short term dissemination strategy for identified best practices including needed training modules is elaborated and at least 2 respective trainings conducted by Q12	4.2.2. A dissemination strategy to reach key target groups on SLM best and good practices and at least 2 respective trainings conducted by Q12.	4.2.2. Assessed and commented dissemination strategy. Records of participants. Training certificates issued.	
	4.2.3. Number of printed and distributed brochures, leaflets and training modules on the SLM best practices in Kazakh and Russian.	4.2.3. Limited number of printed and distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices in Kazakh and Russian.	4.2.3 Learning products developed correspond to those as planned in the dissemination strategy and include outlines of training modules (to be implemented under Outcome 3).	4.2.3. Learning products for dissemination of SLM best practices accordingly developed and disseminated by Q12. 4.2.3. Обучающие продукты для распространения наилучших практик по УУЗР соответственно разработаны и распространены.	4.2.3. Printed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices. Reports on distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices. List of training modules on best practices to be integrated under Outcome 3.	Information materials on SLM (books, press releases, articles in publications, brochures) have been published and actively disseminated through various resources, with the support of other international projects and organizations.
Output 4.3. Strategy	4.3.1.	4.3.1. No strategy for	4.3.1. Strategy for	4.3.1. Recommendations	4.3.1 Strategic	Pilot projects and

<p>for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.</p> <p>Результат 4.3. Подходы для эффективного распространения и тиражирования лучших практик по УУЗР разработаны</p>	Recommendations for the strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the MCB Project Board.	effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.	effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the MCB Project Board by Q10.	for the Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed by Q10.	recommendations for up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices.	national initiatives providing lessons learned and suggestions for up-scaling. Resources for replication system secured.
	4.3.2. A national lists of SLM best practices developed for dissemination on national or regional levels.	4.3.2. No SLM best practices identified for dissemination on national or regional levels.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of good SLM practices / results by Q5.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of good SLM practices / results by Q5.	4.3.2. Reports on national working meetings to identify the list of SLM best practices developed for dissemination.	
	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. No National Forums conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10.	4.3.3. Minutes from a National Forums. Information materials provided during the National Forums.	

GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM CPP: Multi-country Capacity Building Project.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT (KYRGYZSTAN)

Goal	<i>The restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD.</i>						
Objectives/ Outcomes	Output	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Sources of verification	Assumptions	Progress
Outcome 1. Enhanced policy coherence thru mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergy with other multilateral environmental agreements	Capacity strengthened in the field of national legislation to effectively support SLM and to promote synergy with other multilateral environmental agreements	Number of bylaws which have been drafted according to SLM principles and other multilateral environmental agreements	30 bylaws (10 during first year)	Bylaws in the field of LM are not considering efficiently SLM principles and other multilateral environmental agreements Cross-sectoral issues are not respected during drafting of laws Week KSA among responsible governmental officers and jurists in environmental law.	Drafts of bylaws	Commitment of the members of the policy-legislation working group Availability of analytical data and information for working group.	Substantial amendments to the pasture law submitted to the Parliament were approved and signed by the President A State Programme on soil conservation and improvement was developed and submitted to the Government for further promotion; Impact assessment on organic development has been provided upon the request of the Ministry of Agriculture and to be presented at the National Forum on organic development on December 5 th 2012
	SLM principles including funding mechanism integrated into policy	References to NPF and SLM principles in policy dialogue and documents.	In all relevant upcoming political documents SLM principles and	NPF and its parts are not used as a basic document in policy- Lack of incentives for SLM.	Documentation of facts of references to NRF and SLM principles in	NPF will be revised and published specially designed to the needs for decision makers.	Upon the request of the State Forestry Agency, the forest sector reform has been analysed and recommendations were

		Number of incentive political mechanisms for stimulation, support and acknowledgement of SLM in place	NPF are considered. 2 mechanisms in place		political documents and dialogue. Revised NPF		submitted to the State Agency Recommendations on National Action Plan on forestry have been developed and submitted to SAEPF SLM principles are mainstreamed into the national strategic documents (pasture law, CDS 2012-2014, Agro-strategy 2012-2020, etc)
	Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies and legislation	Number of approved bylaws issuing SLM principles and other multilateral environmental agreements. Information material and information campaign specially designed to the needs of decision makers.	20 out of 30 bylaws worked out by the policy-legislation working group approved (3 during the first year) 300 persons have been profiting from information campaign	General low level of awareness among decision-makers who are not in close contact with SLM themes, Information is aggregated and does not permit targeting messages to pertinent decision-makers Awareness of, and the need for, collaborative SLM approaches is recognized as low. Resource users are not involved in the upper levels of policy-making. SLM principles are not	Reports on field visits, round tables, and other events on mainstreaming SLM principles into policy and legislation. Minutes of the meetings of the parliament, committees a.o. Information material and registration journal of delivery.	Active participation of decision makers in information and awareness raising campaign and skills in lobbying SLM.	Capacity of experts (15) on development of legal documents in the SLM field was built Established cooperation with the Parliament Committee on agrarian, water issues and regional development to coordinate SLM activities in country; Support to GEF Interagency Committee have been provided Established Coordination Council on pasture management chaired by the Pasture Department 200 government staff have

				<p>sufficiently considered during decision making in policy and legislation. Unavailability of and lack of access to information (material) on SLM that responds to the need of decision makers Decision makers.</p> <p>During approval of normative documents needs and interests of different stakeholders are not reflected sufficiently.</p>			<p>improved knowledge and skills in SLM through participating at international, regional and national capacity building activities (regional and national study tours, trainings, conferences, MASHAV, etc.)</p>
<p>Outcome 2. Resources Effectively Mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements</p>	<p>National policy-finance working group with KSA to develop DIFS set up</p>	<p>Improvement of knowledge of Working Group on IFS.</p>	<p>Questionnaire at start and end of the training clearly shows progress made. Policy-finance working group sets up priorities, objectives, elements and approach of the national IFS. Policy-finance working group with consultancy assistance prepared the</p>	<p>1 person trained in overall IFS methodology by GM, 2007.</p>	<p>Adaptation of IFS methodology. Certificates Minutes of the working group meeting. Draft national IFS.</p>		<p>About 40 government and non-government staff increased knowledge and skills in IFS development</p>

			draft IFS.				
	National IFS considering internal, external and innovative resources developed and agreed with all stakeholders	Decision makers and donor organizations consider the NPF as a political document, sufficiently detailed and based on analytical data for effective mobilization of resources for support of SLM initiatives.	Comprehensive analysis on effective use of internal resources for SLM promotion and recommendation s on mobilization of external and internal funding. Positive feedback from decision makers and donor organizations on IFS.	IFS absent.	Minutes of meetings, agreements. Letter of agreement. Analyses, reports. Action Plan of IFS. Publication of IFS.	Members of national IFS task groups remain in the task groups. No changes in national internal financing.	IFS has been developed and approved by the Ministry of Economic Regulations
	Package of prioritized SLM programs and projects based on internal and external financial resources (in the frame of NPF) under DIFS developed	Number of SLM programs and projects based on internal and external financial resources developed	5 programs and projects developed	Programs and projects on SLM issues proposed lack detailization and financing	Programs and projects issuing SLM. Documentation of correspondence with donor and national organizations and letters of		IFS and 3 projects as debts swaps have been presented a II South Investment Forum Support to the development of NAP Alignment application for 150k have been provided which resulted approval for full funding Three project ideas have been developed as a result of

					support.		capacity building activity of the project
Outcome 3 Improved interaction between state agencies and land users through human resource development	Package of programs on capacity building on SLM approved and started	Number of strategic development plans and programs of key governmental and nongovernmental organizations focusing on capacity development and staff improvement, developed and agreed with governmental apparatus. % Realisation of strategic plans	6 strategic development plans Min. 30% of strategic development plans implemented.	Lack of strategic development plans of organizations and at a whole.	strategic development plans	No significant reorganization of governmental structures and institutions. Availability of funding for implementation of strategic development plans.	Support provided to non-governmental <u>organisations</u> in their capacity building through the development of respective strategic documents : Lesic-Yug, Association of forest and land users UNCCD FP capacity in SLM has been improved A memorandum on cooperation was developed and signed by MOA and State Forestry Agency for implementation of Rio Conventions A road map on the Memo implementation have been developed and submitted to the Online national report to the UNCCD Secretariat has been submitted with the facilitation of the project
	Improved mechanisms of interaction (communication and coordination) between state	Number of effectively working mechanisms for cooperation/interaction in SLM developed and in	Analysis of gaps and needs and recommendation s on mechanisms for better cooperation	Insufficient or lack of vertical and horizontal cooperation between stakeholders and its importance not recognized.	Documentation of mechanisms of interaction between state agencies, land users and other	Lack of sufficient technical equipment for communication.	The technical and institutional capacity of 17 pasture committees were built through introduction of E-government module on pasture management and

	agencies, land users and other stakeholders in SLM developed and implemented.	place. Number of persons with better knowledge in cooperation and communication on co-SLM.	between governmental structures and resource users and stakeholders finalized. 5 mechanisms for improved interaction developed and implemented and their impact is appreciated among all stakeholders of the cooperation. 500 persons, trained in communication and coordination on co-SLM.		stakeholders Documentation of feed back from all stakeholders of the mechanism. List of participants attending trainings on improved communication and cooperation in co-SLM.	Each participant successfully completes training courses.	provision of IT equipment and trainings More than 100 pasture committees improved skills and knowledge in sustainable pasture management by participating at the exchange 46 community radio staff improved their skills and knowledge in organizational development, designing of the direct "on-air" transmission including SLM
	KSA tools for all stakeholders developed and implemented to support SLM	Number of persons with improved KSA for SLM	Effective tools and approaches for improvement of KSA described. Based on effective tools and training events 250	No systematic training in improved Collaborative SLM practices and principles.	Training modules and materials Certificates	Disincentives (legal, political, socio-economical) for effective implementation of KSA for SLM.	10 secondary school teachers have been trained in teaching of an extra-curricular subject on "My prosperous farm" Teaching material on "Sustainable use of herbs" have been developed, printed out: 50 University

			professionals and governmental officers, 800 resource users, 20000 students and pupils improved their KSA for SLM.				<p>teachers trained in teaching of the textbook</p> <p>A manual and catalogue on irrigation have been developed, printed out and handed over to the Center of Education, Consultation and Innovations in agriculture for further use and dissemination</p> <p>14 facilitators have been trained in joint natural resource management; a training manual have been developed and disseminated among the participants and extension services</p> <p>Short-term and long-term capacity building action plan have been developed</p>
Outcome 4. Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened	Capacity of networks and structures in the field of dissemination of best practices in SLM area improved	Improved cooperation and between networks and structures in the field of dissemination of best practices. % realisation of	<p>Bilateral and multilateral agreements on cooperation between networks and structures</p> <p>Common strategy and plan of networks and structures in the</p>	0 consolidated national-level learning networks. Existing multi-country networks exist for enhanced communication between mountain communities (AGOCA), and structures for water users and farmers federations. These are not necessarily learning	Press from inaugural meetings. Agreements between members to form networks. Learning events and products Action plan.	The CACILM pilot projects produce results that are replicable to different regions or under different conditions. Willingness of different agencies, NGOs, or others to share information and results, especially	<p>More than 100 pasture committee have built non-formal network for further experience information and best practice exchange</p> <p>More than 60 non-governmental organizations have participated at the networking workshop and dare-to-share event</p> <p>Dissemination strategy have been developed</p>

		plans of networks and structures on dissemination and replication of best practices in co-SLM and all stakeholder groups targeted.	field of dissemination and replication of best practices in co-SLM developed. 30% of plans implemented	networks but provide connectivity and a base structure. Electronic networks are CAREC, SLM-KM multi-country and national-level networks to be formed provides access to people with access to computers.		failures	
	Effective mechanism of best practices exchange developed and implemented	Exchange of best practises improved respectively the different spheres of CACILM and different stakeholder groups. High level decision makers officially recommend best practises from pilot projects Number of best practice implemented in certain number of areas	Developed mechanism of best practise exchange considers all spheres of CACILM and all stakeholder levels. 3 recommendations 3 best practises implemented in 3 areas	1 совместная выставка, проведенная CAMP-ALATOO и др. в Душанбе 2008 г. Central-Asian Fair of Ideas 2009, Grant program WB „Effective use of water resources in agriculture“	Publication with detail description of best practise dissemination and replication		4 best SLM practices have been posted on WOCAT web-site Total 49 technologies and approaches have been identified, documented and disseminated (film, catalogue, calendar) The First National Forum on organic agriculture has been supported by the project

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM CPP: Multi-country Capacity Building Project.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT (TURKMENISTAN)

Цель проекта	<i>«Повышение потенциала на национальном международном уровне с целью развития и реализации интегрированного подхода и стратегий по борьбе с деградацией земельных ресурсов в рамках операционной национальной рамочной программы».</i>					
Результат	Компонент	Индикатор	Базовая линия	Цель	Источники проверки	Гипотезы

<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.</p> <p>Результат 1: Совершенствована последовательная политика через активизации принципов УУЗР в национальной политике и законодательстве с целью достижения синергизма с другими экологическими многосторонними соглашениями.</p>	<p>Output 1.1: Key existing national structures for mainstreaming SLM into policy and legislation are strengthened</p> <p>Результат 1.1. Усилены ключевые действующие национальные структуры по внедрению принципов УУЗР в стратегии и законодательство</p>	<p>1.1.1. UNCCD Focal Points and related state agencies meet regularly and discuss SLM issues to promote UNCCD implementation.</p> <p>1.1.Национальный координатор КБО и представители государственных структур (рабочая группа КБО) регулярно встречаются и обсуждают проблемы УУЗР, чтобы способствовать внедрению данных принципов.</p> <p>1.1.UNCCD national Focal point and representatives of governmental bodies (UNCCD working group) meet regularly and discuss SLM issues to promote introduction of SLM principles</p>	<p>1.1.1. UNCCD Focal Points and related state agencies do not meet regularly and the capacity of them does not allow to properly promote UNCCD implementation.</p>	<p>1.1.1. Fully operating UNCCD Focal Point and related state agencies are in place by Q12.</p> <p>1.1.1. Потенциал Национального координатора КБО и соответствующих государственных органов усилен за период работы проекта МПП.</p> <p>1.1.1. Capacity of UNCCD focal point and other relevant state bodies has been strengthened during the project implementation period of MCB.</p>	<p>Minutes from meetings of the UNCCD Focal Point and related state agencies.</p>	<p>The national governmental structures actively support CACILM CP and show the willingness to increase their capacities for UNCCD implementation.</p>
		<p>1.1.2. Members of the UNCCD Working Group have received adequate</p>	<p>1.1.2. The members of the UNCCD Working Group are receiving not</p>	<p>1.1.2. Based on needs capacity building support provided to the members of</p>	<p>Minutes of the UNCCD Working Group meeting.</p>	

	capacity building support.	enough capacity building support.	the UNCCD Working Group by Q12. 1.1.2. Существенно повышен потенциал членов Рабочей группы по КБО исходя из их участия в семинарах, тренингов, рабочих встречах и необходимой методической литературы. 1.1.2. The capacity of UNCCD working group has been increased substantially based on participation in seminars, trainings, working meetings and required methodical literature.	
	1.1.3. UNCCD Focal point and related state agencies actively participates in MCB Project activities.	1.1.3. No MCB project activities before the project start.	1.1.3. Good coordination and working relationship with UNCCD Focal Point and related state agencies by Q12. 1.1.3. Установлена хорошая координация и рабочие отношения с Национальным координатором КБО и соответствующими государственными органами в области УУЗР. 1.1.3	1.1.3. Minutes from MCB project activities with participation of the UNCCD Focal Point and related state agencies.

				Good coordination and working relations are established with UNCCD focal point and other relevant state bodies in the field of SLM.	
		1.1.4. Национальные стратегические документы включают проекты и мероприятия по УУЗР. 1.1.4 National strategic documents include projects and activities on SLM.	1.1.4. Стратегические документы по УУЗР требуют обновления.	1.1.4. Defined projects and activities for SLM included into national strategic documents and implementation supported by Q12. 1.1.4. Определенные проекты и мероприятия по УУЗР включены в национальные стратегические документы (НПДБО, СООС и Стратегия по изменению климата). 1.1.4. defined SLM projects and activities are included into national strategic documents (National Action Program to combat desertification, Strategic Environmental assessment and Climate change strategy)	1.1.4. Черновики национальных стратегических документов, согласованные с уполномоченными органами.
	Output 1.2: Approved strategy for enabling	1.2.1. Государственные программы в целом	1.2.1. Государственные программы не	1.2.1. SLM principles properly integrated into governmental	1.2.1. Опубликованные государственные
					Профилирующие министерства

	policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing.	отражают основные принципы УУЗР. 1.2.1. State programs reflects the main SLM principles	полностью отражают основные принципы УУЗР.	programs by Q12. 1.2.1. Принципы УУЗР надлежащим образом интегрированы в государственные программы к K12. 1.2.1. In a proper manner, SLM principles are integrated into state programs by Q 12	программы; Протоколы обсуждения государственных программ.	поддерживают включение принципов в государственные программ.
		1.2.2. Проекты Изменений и дополнений в Водный кодекс (2004) и Изменений и дополнений в Земельный кодекс (2004) для внедрения принципов УУЗР разработаны и обсуждены на расширенном заседании Рабочей группы по КБО.	1.2.2. Требуется внесение изменений и дополнений в Водный кодекс (2004) и Земельный кодекс (2004) для внедрения принципов УУЗР.	1.2.2. SLM principles properly integrated into legislation by Q12. 1.2.2. Принципы УУЗР подготовлены надлежащим образом и могут быть интегрированы в законодательство (закон «О пастбищах», кодексы «О земле» и «О воде». 1.2.2 SLM principles are prepared in a proper manner and can be integrated in legislation (Law on Pastures, Land Code and Water Code)	1.2.2. Протокол расширенного заседания Рабочей группы по КБО; Подготовлена стратегия внесения дополнений и изменений в кодексы опубликована в методической литературе и распространена. Strategy of making amendments and changes for Land and Water Codes is prepared and published in methodical book and disseminated.	Дополнения и изменения в действующее законодательство поддержаны профилирующими министерствами.
		1.2.3. SLM principles and incentive mechanisms integrated into national	1.2.3. SLM principles and incentive mechanisms are not	1.2.3. SLM principles and incentive mechanisms developed and approved	1.2.3. Approved and published legislative acts	Принципы УУЗР и стимулирующие механизмы

		strategies and legislation.	adequately integrated into national strategies and legislation.	when appropriate by Q12. 1.2.3. Принципы УУЗР и стимулирующие механизмы отражены в выпущенных книгах проекта и в стратегии земельных отношений. 1.2.3. SLM principles and incentive mechanisms are reflected in published books of the project and in the strategy of land regulations.	and strategies. Книга: «Устойчивое управление земельными ресурсами. Анализ состояния и перспектив развития» Book: "SLM. Analysis of current condition and development perspectives"	поддержаны профилирующими министерствами.
	Output 1.3: Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies.	1.3.1. Decision-makers started using SLM goals, objectives and principles.	1.3.1. Awareness on SLM goals, objectives and principles within governmental structures need improvement.	1.3.1. High level (>75%) of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies demonstrate awareness by Q12. 1.3.1. Высокий уровень (>78%) ответов на исследование в области осведомленности среди государственных организаций к K12. 1.3.1. High level of responses (>78%) to awareness survey among state bodies by Q12	1.3.1. Results of awareness surveys at the national levels undertaken twice, at Q7 and Q12. Протоколы встреч в ведущих министерствах в области УУЗР и результаты анкетирования. Minutes of the meetings in ministries working on SLM and questionnaire results.	All targeted groups awareness survey actively and honestly respond to survey questions.
		1.3.2. Decision-makers have access to the information	1.3.2. Decision-makers don't have proper	1.3.2. Information materials and knowledge building	1.3.2. Information materials	Enough data for developing of the

		materials and knowledge building activities.	access to the information materials and knowledge building activities.	activities developed responding to the needs of decision-makers by Q8. 1.3.2. Информационные материалы и мероприятия по повышению осведомленности разработаны на основе повышения потенциала ведущих министерств в области УУЗР. 1.3.2. Information materials and knowledge building activities developed based on capacity building lead ministries in SLM field.	developed. Протоколы встреч в ведущих министерствах в области УУЗР Minutes of the meetings in ministries working on SLM	information materials for decision-makers.
Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements	Output 2.1. National multi-stakeholder working group is established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing IFSs. Компонент 2.1. Создана Национальная	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 defined by national project team.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 is not available.	2.1.1. Determination of baseline financial flows to SLM by Q6. 2.1.1. Определена базовая линия финансовых потоков в области УУЗР. 2.1.1. Baseline of financial flows in SLM are determined	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 is included into IFS.	National project team is in place.
		2.1.2. The amount of new	2.1.2. No Integrated	2.1.2.	2.1.2. Official published	Positive overall

Результат 2: Ресурсы для содействия инициативам УУЗР эффективно мобилизованы с целью продвижения синергизма с другими экологическими многосторонними соглашениями.	рабочая группа по ИФС, владеющая знаниями, умениями и инструментами для разработки ИФС.	national funding commitments for SLM above the baseline yr. 2008.	Financing Strategies exist in CA countries.	2.1.2. Финансовые потоки в области УУЗР и разработаны рекомендации по их мобилизации. 2.1.2. Financial flows in SLM and recommendations on mobilization are developed.	information on SLM financial flows. Законченный рабочий документ по ИФС. Final working document on IFS	financial situation. Enough national and international donors willing to support SLM activities/projects.
		2.1.3. Adapted IFS training module used for conducting National DIFS workshop.	2.1.3. IFS training module is not adapted for Turkmenistan conditions.	2.1.3. Тренинговый модуль по ИФС адаптирован к национальным условиям. 2.1.3. Training module on IFS adapted to national conditions.	2.1.3. Minutes of the National DIFS workshop. Материалы проведенных тренингов и семинаров по разработке ИФС. Materials of conducted trainings and seminars on IFS development	Needed support received from the MCB regional CBU.
		2.1.4. The number of persons qualified to develop IFS.	2.1.4. No qualified persons to develop IFS.	2.1.4. At least 50 persons trained in IFS methodology by Q6. 2.1.4. Как минимум 50 человек обучены методологии ИФС. 2.1.4. At least 50 people are trained on IFS methodology.	2.1.4. Minutes of the National DIFS workshop.	Members of trained national IFS task groups remain active in the task groups.
	Output 2.2. Integrated Financing Strategy drafted and endorsed	2.2.1. The IFS for Turkmenistan developed and submitted for approval	2.2.1. No IFS for Turkmenistan.	2.2.1. ИФС передана в МОП Туркменистана для дальнейшего	2.2.1. Minutes of the meetings with the appropriate national	Needed support of the appropriate national authorities

	by national stakeholders.	by appropriate national authorities.		использования. 2.2.1. IFS is given to Ministry of environment of Turkmenistan for further disposal.	authorities.	for IFS development
	Компонент 2.2. Национальная ИФС разработана национальными и международными заинтересованными сторонами.					
	Output 2.3 SLM Investment Programs Developed.	2.3.1. The Integrated Investment Program developed in accordance with Integrated Financing Strategy.	2.3.1. No SLM Investment Program responding with Integrated Financing Strategy developed.	2.3.1. UNCCD Focal Point and related state agencies have re-defined roles and updated functions for IIFs implementation, policy-making, financing, and capacity building by Q8. 2.3.1. Национальный координатор КБО и соответствующие государственные органы осведомлены методам мобилизации финансовых ресурсов после ознакомления с ИФС. 2.3.1. UNCCD focal point and relevant state bodies are informed on financial	2.3.1. Publically available Integrated Investment Program. Законченный рабочий документ по ИФС. Final working document on IFS	Members of national IFS task group remain in the task group during development and implementation of the projects.

				resources mobilization methods after getting acquitted with IFS.		
	Output 2.4: National SLM investment projects developed and submitted for financing Результат 2.4. Национальные инвестиционные проекты по УУЗР представлены для финансирования.	2.4.1. Number of the developed project concepts supporting SLM principles.	2.4.1. No SLM Investment Program responding with Integrated Financing Strategy.	2.4.1. At least 3 project concepts developed on the basis of Integrated Investment Frameworks and submitted for financing 2.4.1. Три проектные идеи подробно разработаны на основе ИФС. 2.4.1. Tree projects ideas are developed on the basis of IFS	2.4.1. Developed SLM project concepts.	Members of national IFS task groups remain in the task groups during development and implementation of the projects.
Outcome 3. Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through human resource development Результат 3: Взаимодействие между государственными органами и	Output 3.1. National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plans and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders responsible for inter-action between state agencies and land users are integrated into relevant national strategic documents	3.1.1. Turkmenistan National CBU established within the national project team and involved experts.	3.1.1. No Turkmenistan National CBU exist by Q1.	3.1.1. 5 CBUs established within the national project teams and involved experts to coordinate the SLM CB Programs. 3.1.1. 5 Национальные группы реализации проекта созданы и включают в себя проектные команды и привлекаемых экспертов для координации программ по повышению потенциала	3.1.1. Reports of the Turkmenistan National CBU.	UNCCD Focal Point and related State agencies support MCB project.

<p>землепользователя ми повышено через развитие человеческих ресурсов.</p>	<p>Результат 3.1. Национальные Краткосрочные планы действий по повышению потенциала и долгосрочные приоритеты по повышению потенциала для заинтересованных сторон в области УУЗР, ответственных за взаимодействие между гос. органами и землепользователями интегрированы в соответствующие национальные стратегические документы.</p>			<p>в области УУЗР</p> <p>3.1.1.</p> <p>5 National PIUs are established and include project teams and experts for coordination of programs on SLM capacity building</p>		
		<p>3.1.2. Developed SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.</p>	<p>3.1.2. No National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.</p>	<p>3.1.2. A National-level, short- term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders developed. by Q8.</p> <p>3.1.2. Национальный Краткосрочный план действий по повышению потенциала и долгосрочные приоритеты по повышению потенциала для заинтересованных сторон в области УУЗР разработаны.</p> <p>3.1.2. National-level Short- term plan of capacity building activities and long term priorities on capacity building on SLM for interested parties are developed.</p>	<p>2.1.2. Published SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.</p> <p>Долгосрочная программа по повышению потенциала для заинтересованных сторон в области УУЗР опубликована в книге: «Устойчивое управление земельными ресурсами. Анализ состояния и перспектив развития».</p> <p>Long-term program on SLM capacity building for interested parties is published "SLM. Analysis of</p>	<p>UNCCD Focal Point and related State agencies support national-level, short- term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.</p>

			current condition and development perspectives"
3.1.3. Activities, including into the annual working plans for the implementation of the National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan implemented by related State agencies.	3.1.3. No activities, including into the annual working plans for the implementation of the National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan.	<p>3.1.3. A National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders implemented through Q12.</p> <p>3.1.3. Национальный Краткосрочный план действий по повышению потенциала для заинтересованных министерств в области УУЗР выполнен.</p> <p>3.1.3. National short-term plan on SLM capacity building for interested ministries is accomplished.</p>	<p>3.1.3. Minutes and reports from the activities, including into the annual working plans for the implementation of the National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan</p> <p>Протоколы семинаров и итоговые документы проекта МПП.</p> <p>Minutes of the seminars and final MCB project documents</p>
3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building priorities integrated into National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building priorities not integrated into National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	<p>3.1.4. A National-level long-term SLM Capacity Building priorities integrated into relevant national strategic documents by Q12.</p> <p>3.1.4. Национальные долгосрочные приоритеты по повышению потенциала для заинтересованных сторон в области УУЗР в</p>	3.1.4. Published National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.

				<p>целом интегрированы в соответствующие национальные стратегические документы (НПДБО, СООС и Стратегия по изменению климата).</p> <p>3.1.4. National Long-Term priorities on SLM capacity building for interested parties are integrated in national strategic documents (National Action Program to combat desertification, Strategic Environmental assessment and Climate change strategy)</p>		
	<p>Output 3.2. Mechanisms for communication and coordination between state organizations and land users are enhanced</p> <p>Результат 3.2. Механизмы по коммуникации и координации между гос. органами и землепользователями усилены</p>	<p>3.2.1. Main mechanisms for communication and coordination between state organizations and land users are included into the draft of the Communication and coordination action plan.</p>	<p>3.2.1. No draft of the Communication and coordination action plan.</p>	<p>3.2.1. A Communication and coordination action plan developed by Q7.</p> <p>3.2.1. План работы, действий по координации и механизмы коммуникации разработаны.</p> <p>3.2.1. Working Plan, Action plan for coordination and communication mechanisms are developed</p>	<p>3.2.1. Draft of the Communication and coordination action plan.</p> <p>Протоколы рабочих встреч, семинаров и тренингов с землепользователями.</p> <p>Minutes of Working meetings, seminars and trainings with land users.</p>	UNCCD Focal Point and related State agencies support Communication and coordination action
		<p>3.2.2. Number of activities under Communication and</p>	<p>3.2.2. No activities under Communication</p>	<p>3.2.2. A Communication and coordination action plan</p>	<p>3.2.2. Minutes of the UNCCD Working Group.</p>	

		coordination action plan.	and coordination action plan.	<p>agreed with the UNCCD Working Group and implementation started by Q8.</p> <p>3.2.2. План действий по координации и коммуникации согласован с Рабочей группой по КБО и выполнен.</p> <p>3.2.2. Coordination and communication Action Plan is agreed with UNCCD working group and accomplished.</p>	Reports on activities under Communication and coordination action plan.	
	Output 3.3 Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a. collaborative approach in SLM	3.3.1. Decision-makers and land users receive and use knowledge on SLM.	3.3.1. No systematic trainings in improved Collaborative SLM modules, practices and principles.	<p>3.3.1. Total of 250 persons trained in Turkmenistan using Modular training programmes (e.g. collaborative land-use planning, Designing Integrated Financing Strategies, Participatory SLM Project Design Basics).</p> <p>3.3.1. В общей сложности 290 человек в Туркменистане обучены с использованием тренинговых модулей (напр. совместное планирование землепользования, ИФС, методы повышения</p>	<p>3.3.1. Records of participants.</p> <p>Training certificates issued.</p>	Each participant successfully completes each module in the training courses and uses the knowledge received.

				<p>урожайности пастбищ, применение наилучших практик в области УУЗР и др.).</p> <p>3.3.1. Total of 290 persons trained in Turkmenistan using Modular training programs (e.g. collaborative land-use planning, IFS, pasture productivity increasing methods, use of best practices of SLM ,etc).</p>		
		3.3.2. Trainers on SLM use their knowledge for educating of the decision-makers and land users	3.3.2. Limited number of trainers for SLM available.	<p>3.3.2. At least 4 trainers trained by Q12.</p> <p>3.3.2. Обучены 14 тренеров в области УУЗР.</p> <p>3.3.2. 14 trainers are trained on SLM.</p>	3.3.2. Records of participants. Training certificates issued.	
Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and	Output 4.1. Stakeholders relevant for SLM actively exchange thematic information and experiences	4.1.1. Number of the national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	4.1.1. Not enough national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	<p>4.1.1. National level learning and consultative activities implemented with close cooperation of diverse group of stakeholders by Q12.</p> <p>4.1.1. Обучающие и</p>	4.1.1. Minutes and records of participants. of national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	Stakeholders support national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.

strengthened.	Результат 4.1. Заинтересованные стороны в области УУЗР активно обмениваются тематической информацией и опытом			консультационные мероприятия исполнены на национальном уровне в тесном сотрудничестве с широкой группой заинтересованных сторон. 4.1.1. Learning and consultative activities implemented on national level in close cooperation with diverse group of stakeholders.		
	Output 4.2. Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders	4.2.1. Number of best practices disseminated on national level.	4.2.1. Best practices are not disseminated on national level.	4.2.1. At least 12 best practices disseminated on national level by Q12. 4.2.1. Как минимум 14 наилучших практик распространены на национальном уровне. 4.2.1. At least 14 best practices are disseminated on national level.	4.2.1. Reports and records of participants of the events for dissemination of the best practices on national level.	Stakeholders support and use disseminated best practices.
		4.2.2. Number of conducted trainings for governmental structures, NGOs and land users on national level.	4.2.2. Limited number of trainings was conducted to governmental structures, NGOs and land users.	4.2.2. At least 11 trainings conducted to governmental structures, NGOs and land users by Q12. 4.2.2. Как минимум 14	4.2.2. Press publications related to best practices dissemination. Reports from best practices dissemination activities. Reports and records of	

				<p>тренинг проведены для гос. органов, НПО и землепользователей.</p> <p>4.2.2. At least 14 trainings conducted to governmental structures, NGOs and land users</p>	<p>participants from trainings.</p> <p>Training certificates issued.</p>
	4.2.3. Number of printed and distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices on three languages (Turkmen, Russian and English).	4.2.3. Limited number of printed and distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices on three languages (Turkmen, Russian and English).	4.2.3. State structures, NGOs and land users are aware of the best practices of SLM.	4.2.3. Printed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices on three languages (Turkmen, Russian and English).	Reports on distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices.
	<p>Output 4.3. Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.</p> <p>Результат 4.3. Подходы для эффективного распространения и</p>	4.3.1. National recommendations for the Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices provided to the Regional CBU.	4.3.1. Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices is not developed.	4.3.1. Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the Project Board by Q10.	4.3.1. Report on providing the National recommendations for the Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices.
		4.3.1. Национальные	4.3.1. Подходы для эффективного	4.3.1. Методы по эффективному	

	тиражирования лучших практик по УУЗР разработаны	рекомендации к подходам для эффективного распространения и тиражирования лучших практик по УУЗР предоставлены на региональный уровень.	распространения и тиражирования лучших практик по УУЗР не определены.	распространению и тиражированию наилучших практик по УУЗР, разработаны и полностью выполнены. 4.3.1. Methods of effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and fully accomplished.	Письма – заявки на получение методической литературы. Letters-requires for purchase of methodical literature.	
		4.3.2. Number of SLM best practices selected as priority SLM best practices for dissemination.	4.3.2. No SLM best practices selected as priority SLM best practices for dissemination.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of priority good SLM practices / results by Q6. 4.3.2. Первоначальный объем приоритетных практик / результатов по УУЗР определен. 4.3.2. Initial scope of priority practices/results on SLM is determined.	4.3.2. Minutes and report of the National working meeting to identify priority good SLM practices.	Stakeholders and SLM projects are open to share SLM best practices for dissemination.
		4.3.3. Up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt conducted at National Forum.	4.3.2. No National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10. 4.3.3. Национальный форум	4.3.3. Minutes and and records of participants from National Forum.	

			по распространению и тиражированию наилучших практик и полученных уроков проведен.		
			4.3.3. A National Forum on up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt is conducted		

GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM CPP: Multi-country Capacity Building Project.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT (UZBEKISTAN)

Goal	The restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD.					
Objectives/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target value	Target	Sources of verification	Results
Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements.	1.1.1. Degree of independent development and quality of national reports of the UNCCD.	1.1.1. The capacities of the Nsec to plan, implement and reporting directly related to the implementation of the UNCCD as well as promoting synergies among the Rio Conventions need to be	1.1.1. The capacities of the Nsec to plan, implement and reporting directly related to the implementation of the UNCCD as well as promoting synergies among the Rio	1.1.1. The capacities of the Nsec to plan, implement and reporting directly related to the implementation of the UNCCD as well as promoting synergies among the Rio Conventions are	1.1.1. Minutes from meetings of the NCC.	Capacity of NSec was strengthened during field visits, workshops and trainings including adaptation climate change events. Support of on-line UNCCD reporting

Output 1.1. Existing national structures for mainstreaming SLM into policy and legislation are strengthened.		strengthened.	Conventions are strengthened through Q12.	strengthened through Q12.		process through providing of related information.
	1.1.2. Amount and quality of capacity building support which members of the NCC receive.	1.1.2. The NCC do not systematically receive demand-driven capacity building support.	1.1.2. At least two targeted capacity building events are conducted for NCC members per year (trainings, study tours...).	1.1.2. Based on needs capacity building support provided to the NCC members to foster UNCCD implementation through Q12.	1.1.2. Minutes and other documentation of the events conducted.	Capacity building support provided to the NCC members during field visits, workshops and trainings including international
	1.1.3. Level of participation of NSEC Uzbekistan in MCB project activities.	1.1.3. No MCB project activities before the project start.	1.1.3. NSEC Uzbekistan are aware of and actively participate in MCB project activities.	1.1.3. Good coordination and working relationship with NSEC Uzbekistan.	1.1.3. Written communication, minutes from MCB project activities.	Good working relationship with NSEC was established. NSEC was involved actively into the project planning and implementation.
	1.1.4. Quantity and quality of integration of SLM principles and approaches in the revised UNCCD NAP for Uzbekistan.	1.1.4. Use of synergies with other Rio-conventions insufficient and SLM data and approaches partly outdated.	1.1.4. The revised UNCCD NAP includes strategies to use synergies with other relevant environmental conventions and integrates properly SLM principles and most important issues	1.1.4. SLM principles and approaches properly integrated in the revised UNCCD NAP for Uzbekistan by Q11.	1.1.4. Revised UNCCD NAP of Uzbekistan.	IFS developed and passed to Working Group on revision of UNCCD NAP to be a base for inclusion issues of resource mobilization in the NAP.

			for the country.			
Output 1.2. Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative financing.	1.2.0. Publication of strategic recommendations to foster an enabling environment for SLM in Uzbekistan which are approved by the NCC.	1.2.0. Publication of strategic recommendations to foster an enabling environment for SLM in Uzbekistan is not available and a respective analysis was not yet undertaken.	1.2.0. Strategic recommendations to foster an enabling environment for SLM in Uzbekistan are published.	1.2.0. Assessment of enabling environment for SLM carried out and strategic recommendations developed and approved by NCC by Q7.	1.2.0. Published strategic recommendations to foster enabling environment for SLM in Uzbekistan.	Assessment of enabling environment for SLM carried out; strategic recommendations developed. Main parts of the assessment were included in IFS.
	1.2.1. Degree of inclusion of SLM principles into the Uzbekistan Welfare Improvement Strategy (2011-2014)	1.2.1. The Uzbekistan Welfare Improvement Strategy (2011-2014) is not elaborated.	1.2.1. The Uzbekistan Welfare Improvement Strategy is elaborated and includes most important SLM principles as integrated part to foster improvement of livelihoods of the rural population.	1.2.1. The Uzbekistan Welfare Improvement Strategy (2011-2014) includes SLM principles as integrated part to foster improvement of livelihoods of the rural population by Q9.	1.2.1. Commented Welfare Improvement Strategy (2011-2014) by the NCC.	Drafting of WIS was supported by providing relevant expertise and information. As a result sustainable management of land and water resources was indicated in the document as priority direction during WIS-2 implementation period
	1.2.2. Quality of the process of the revision and discussions of proposed adaptations of at least two regulations or laws of Uzbekistan relevant for SLM with main	1.2.2. First proposals of adaptations of the "land code" and the "law on farm enterprises" were handed in to the government of Uzbekistan for revision.	1.2.2. Provision of support on participatory development of proposals for adaptation of the "Land code", the "Code on farm enterprises" and/or	1.2.2. SLM principles properly integrated into legislation (all required documents on adaptation of the "Land code", the "Code on farm enterprises" and/or the regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers on "The	1.2.2. Reports of national consultants; final versions of proposals; information about endorsed adaptations (if available)	Support provided for participatory process of Development some amendments to legislative base focused on the improvement of the use and protection of pasture lands. Minselvodkhoz is

	stakeholders.		the regulation of the cabinet of ministers on "The improvement of the use and protection of pasture lands".	improvement of the use and protection of pasture lands" submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers for final approval) by Q12.		preparing final set of documents for approval to the Cabinet of Ministers in accordance with official procedure
	1.2.3. Inclusion of IFS, innovative best practices and approaches on SLM into revised UNCCD NAP of Uzbekistan.	1.2.3. IFS, innovative best practices and approaches on SLM are not (IFS) or insufficiently included in the UNCCD NAP.	1.2.3. At least significant features of the IFS and identified innovative best practices and approaches on SLM are included in the revised UNCCD NAP.	1.2.3. The integration of the IFS, innovative best practices, SLM principles and incentive mechanisms is considered during the revision of the UNCCD NAP by Q8.	1.2.3. Commented revised UNCCD NAP.	NAP alignment process is about to be officially launched. The strategic documents developed by project were already handed over to the national working group for the NAP alignment and revision process.
Output 1.3. Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies.	1.3.1. Level of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies demonstrate awareness.	1.3.1. Awareness on collaborative SLM approaches within governmental structures in CA countries is low.	1.3.1. Awareness (and its change during the project phase) of key representatives of state level agencies on SLM is measured twice, at Q8 and Q12.	1.3.1. High level (>75%) of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies demonstrate awareness by Q12.	1.3.1. Results of awareness surveys at the national levels undertaken twice, at Q8 and Q12.	Survey was not conducted.
	1.3.2 Quantity, quality and accessibility of thematic background materials on different thematic topics of	1.3.2. Information materials available are not sufficient to provide flexible and demand-driven SLM-related	1.3.2 Background information materials on different thematic topics of SLM are available and	1.3.2 Thematic background materials on different thematic topics of SLM are available for flexible use in order to	1.3.2. Information materials developed.	A number of initiatives on awareness raising and development of skills of decision makers were conducted. Thematic

	SLM.	advisory and training support for decision makers and other relevant stakeholders.	accessible for the MCB national coordination unit, NSEC and NCC members to support advisory services.	provide appropriate advisory services and training support even on ad-hoc requests by Q11.		back ground materials were developed and distributed including thematic calendars, SLM brochure, disks etc.
	1.3.3. Participation of relevant decision makers in international high-level events directly linked with SLM mainstreaming.	1.3.3. Relevant decision makers often lack needed means and information necessary to actively participate in high level international events directly linked with SLM mainstreaming.	1.3.3. Selected decision makers participate in at least one high level international event directly linked with SLM mainstreaming with obvious relevance for Uzbekistan.	1.3.3. Relevant decision makers were able to participate in important high-level events directly linked with SLM mainstreaming through Q12.	1.3.3. Official requests from relevant decision makers. Programs of the events with supported participation of selected decision makers. List of participants of those events.	Relevant decision makers and other key stakeholders participated in important international events (RIO+20) and the study tour to the Murray-Darling River Basin (Australia)
Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements. Output 2.1. National multi-stakeholder working group is established replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing IFS.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM are not defined.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM are known and included into IFS.	2.1.1. Determination of baseline financial flows to SLM by Q8.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 as included into IFS.	Base line financial flow to SLM defined on the base of accessible data
	2.1.2. The amount of new national funding commitments for SLM.	2.1.2. No Integrated Financing Strategies exist in CA countries.	2.1.2. National funding commitments for SLM exceed baseline yr. financial flows by 15 %.	2.1.2. Increase in baseline financial flows by 15 % by Q12.	2.1.2. Official published information on SLM financial flows.	Lack of Official published information on SLM financial flows not allow to estimate changes
	2.1.3. Availability of adapted IFS training module for	2.1.3. IFS training module is not adapted for Uzbekistan conditions.	2.1.3. IFS training module is adapted to Uzbek conditions.	2.1.3. Adaptation of training modules of IFS for Uzbekistan by Q4.	2.1.3. Minutes of the National DIFS workshop.	Training modules of IFS adapted for Uzbekistan

	conducting National DIFS workshop.					
	2.1.4. The number of persons qualified to develop IFS.	2.1.4. No qualified persons to develop IFS.	2.1.4 At least 30 persons trained on IFS methodology.	2.1.4 At least 30 persons in the country qualified to develop Integrated Financing Strategies by Q4.	2.1.4. Minutes of the National DIFS workshop.	Key stakeholders (46 participants) strengthened their capacity on IFS development
Output 2.2. Integrated Financing Strategy drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.	2.2.1. Status of development and submission for approval of the IFS for Uzbekistan.	2.2.1. No IFS for Uzbekistan in place.	2.2.1. The IFS for Uzbekistan developed and submitted for approval by appropriate national authorities.	2.2.1 Integrated Financing Strategy developed, agreed and submitted to NCC for approval by Q9.	2.2.1. Minutes of the meetings with the appropriate national authorities.	Draft IFS agreed with NCC and currently in the process of finalization.
Output 2.3. SLM Integrated Investment Frameworks Developed.	2.3.1. Contents, volume and status of agreement with responsible governmental bodies of developed portfolio of synergetic project concepts as part of the National Integrated Investment Framework.	2.3.1. No SLM Investment Program responding with Integrated Financing Strategy developed.	2.3.1. The Integrated Investment Framework developed in accordance with Integrated Financing Strategy.	2.3.1. NSEC is using IIF as the background for financing and capacity building activities by Q10.	2.3.1. Integrated Investment Framework.	
Output 2.4. National SLM investment projects developed and submitted for financing.	2.4.1. Contents, volume and status of agreement with responsible governmental bodies	2.4.1. No SLM Investment Program responding with Integrated Financing Strategy developed.	2.4.1. The Integrated Investment Program developed in accordance with Integrated Financing	2.4.1. A portfolio of synergetic project concepts for National Integrated Investment Framework developed and	2.4.1. Publically available Integrated Investment Program.	13 project ideas presented and agreed by IFS Working Group

	of developed portfolio of synergetic project concepts as part of the National Integrated Investment Framework.		Strategy.	agreed with responsible governmental bodies.		
Outcome 3: Improved inter-action between state agencies and land users through human resource development	3.1.1. Existence of a national CBU in Uzbekistan.	3.1.1. No Uzbekistan National CBU exists by Q1.	3.1.1. Uzbekistan National CBU established with the national project team and involved experts.	3.1.1. Uzbekistan National CBU established with the national project team and involved experts to coordinate the SLM CB activities.	3.1.1. Reports of the Uzbekistan National CBU.	Uzbekistan National CBU established with the national project team and involved experts to coordinate the SLM CB activities
Output 3.1. National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plans and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders responsible for inter-action between state agencies and land users are integrated into relevant national strategic documents.	3.1.2. Existence of a national short-term Capacity Building Action Plan.	3.1.2. No National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders is available.	3.1.2. Developed SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan by Q8.	3.1.2. Short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders to be implemented by the MCB project are agreed with the NCC by Q8.	3.1.2. Prepared document - SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders.	National short-term Capacity Building Action Plan developed with participation of key stakeholders. Long-term CB building priorities identified ready for integration into NAP Alignment process
	3.1.3. Quantity and quality of activities conducted for the implementation of Short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders	3.1.3. No short-term Capacity Building Action Plans for SLM stakeholders implemented by Q1	3.1.3. At least 3 activities conducted for the implementation of Short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders	3.1.3. Short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders implemented through Q12.	3.1.3. Agendas for MCB Project activities, discussed with related stakeholders. Minutes of the MCB Project activities.	The project followed the implementation of developed short-term Capacity Building Action Plan

			with proper preparation and participation of related stakeholders.		Participants' evaluation of the MCB Project activities.	
	3.1.4. Extent of inclusion of national strategic directions on capacity building for SLM into the revised UNCCD NAP of Uzbekistan.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building priorities not integrated into National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building strategic directions and priorities are integrated into the National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. The revised NAP of UNCCD reflects the results of "Global Ecological Conventions: Strategic Directions of Action for Capacity Building" (NCSA) which are relevant for SLM by Q9.	3.1.4. Prepared document - National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	Strategic directions on capacity building developed and reflected NCSA results which are relevant for SLM. The document was handed over to the national working group for the NAP alignment and revision process.
Output 3.2. Mechanisms for communication and coordination between state organizations and land users are enhanced.	3.2.1. Availability of concrete recommendations to improve communication and cooperation between selected relevant state organizations and land users.	3.2.1. No draft of the Communication and coordination action plan in place.	3.2.1. Main mechanisms for improved communication and coordination between selected relevant state organizations and land users are elaborated and discussed with the NCC.	3.2.1. A Communication and coordination action plan to improve the communication and coordination mechanisms between selected state agencies and land users by capacity building measures is elaborated by Q8.	3.2.1. Draft of the Communication and coordination action plan.	Activities on improved communication and coordination between state and local stakeholders were implemented through awareness raising events on SLM with high level decision makers' participation.
	3.2.2. Degree of integration of identified needs for improvement of the communication and	3.2.2. Very weak integration in current UNCCD NAP.	3.2.2 Main recommendations for the improvement of the communication and cooperation	3.2.2 Identified needs for improvement of the communication and cooperation between selected state agencies	3.2.2. Published National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	Needs for improvement of the communication and cooperation identified and was handed over to the

	cooperation between selected state agencies and land user groups into the revised UNCCD NAP of Uzbekistan.		between selected state agencies and land user groups are included into the revised UNCCD NAP.	and land user groups are reflected in the chapter on Capacity Building of the revised UNCCD NAP by Q9.		national working group for the NAP alignment and revision process
	3.2.3. Number and quality of implemented capacity building measures for land user groups and state agencies to foster their communication and cooperation on SLM relevant topics.	3.2.3. No targeted capacity building measures to foster communication and cooperation on SLM relevant topics provided for land user groups and respective state agencies.	3.2.3. At least 4 trainings and consultations organized for land user groups and selected state agencies to foster their communication and cooperation on SLM relevant issues.	3.2.3 The implementation of Communication and coordination action plan to improve communication and coordination mechanisms between selected state agencies and land user groups is supported through Q12.	3.2.3. Documentation of implemented capacity building measures.	Activities on improved communication and coordination between state and local stakeholders were implemented through awareness raising events on SLM with high level decision makers' participation.
Output 3.3. Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.	3.3.1 Number of persons trained on thematic topics of collaborative SLM.	3.3.1. No systematic trainings in improved Collaborative SLM modules, practices and principles available.	3.3.1. Representatives of selected state agencies and land users receive and use knowledge on SLM.	3.3.1 Total of at least 200 persons are trained in one of three modular training courses on different thematic areas developed by Q11.	3.3.1. Records of participants. Training certificates issued.	254 persons trained during training events on finance resource mobilization, sustainable pasture management, agroforestry and other
	3.3.2. Number of trainers trained on thematic topics of collaborative SLM.	3.3.2. Limited number of trainers for SLM available.	3.3.2. At least 24 trainers are trained on SLM relevant topics.	3.3.2. At least 24 trainers are trained by Q10.	3.3.2. Records of participants. Training certificates issued.	More than 30 persons trained on training methodology and thematic issues related to sustainable land

						management.
Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened. Output 4.1. Stakeholders relevant for SLM actively exchange thematic information and experiences.	4.1.1. Number of the national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	4.1.1. Not enough national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	4.1.1. At least one exchange and consultative activity with a diverse group of relevant stakeholders is conducted.	4.1.1. The outreach to relevant stakeholders for SLM in Uzbekistan in the frame of knowledge management is assured.	4.1.1. Minutes and records of participants. of national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	Events dedicated World Comb Desertification Da International Environment Day, Wor Earth Day conducted raise awareness of wid range of stakeholder on different aspects combat lar degradation includi promoting SLM be practices.
Output 4.2. Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced among relevant stakeholders.	4.2.1. Number of best and good practices documented and disseminated at national level.	4.2.1. Best practices are not captured and documented at national level.	4.2.1. At least 8 best and good practices on SLM are documented and disseminated.	4.2.1. At least 8 best and good practices identified, assessed, documented and disseminated at national level by Q12.	4.2.1. Documentations of best practices under WOCAT standard. Good practices documentations (information flyers; publications). Minutes of the dissemination events.	8 good and be practices disseminate via publication information material documentary, training, etc.) 6 best practice documented and poste to the WOCAT system
	4.2.2. Existence and quality of a dissemination strategy for the identified best practices at national	4.2.2. No systemic documentation of best practices and, hence, dissemination plans available.	4.2.2. A short term dissemination strategy for identified best practices including needed training modules is	4.2.2. A dissemination strategy on SLM best practices including needed training modules to reach key target groups is elaborated and at least 5	4.2.2. Assessed and commented dissemination strategy. Records of participants. Training certificates	Dissemination strategy developed and 5 SL Best practices training conducted

	level.		elaborated and at least 5 respective trainings conducted.	respective trainings conducted by Q12.	issued.	
	4.2.3. Number of printed and distributed brochures, leaflets and training modules on the SLM best practices in Uzbek and Russian.	4.2.3. Limited number of printed and distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices in Uzbek and Russian.	4.2.3. Learning products developed correspond to those as planned in the dissemination strategy and include outlines of training modules (to be implemented under Outcome 3).	4.2.3. Learning products on SLM best practices to reach key target groups developed and disseminated.	4.2.3. Printed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices in Uzbek and Russian. Reports on distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices. List of training modules on best practices to be integrated under Outcome 3.	Brochures, leaflets and training modules on the SLM best practices in Uzbek and Russian printed and distributed
Output 4.3. Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.	4.3.1. Recommendations for the strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the MCB Project Board.	4.3.1. No strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.	4.3.1. Recommendations for the strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the MCB Project Board.	4.3.1. Recommendations for the Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed by Q10.	4.3.1. Developed Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices. Minutes of the MCB Project Board Meeting.	Is implementing Regional level

	4.3.2. A national lists of SLM best practices developed for dissemination on national or regional levels.	4.3.2. No SLM best practices identified for dissemination on national or regional levels.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of good SLM practices / results by Q5.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of good SLM practices / results by Q5.	4.3.2. Reports on national working meetings to identify the list of SLM best practices developed for dissemination.	Initial scoping of good SLM practices
	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. No National Forums conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10.	4.3.3. Minutes from a National Forums. Information materials provided during the National Forum.	National Forum was not conducted

GEF/UNDP/GIZ/GM CACILM CPP: Multi-country Capacity Building Project.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT (TAJIKISTAN)

	Objectively verifiable indicators						
Goal	The restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of the UNCCD.						
Objectives/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target Value (of the indicator)	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions	Results (Tajikistan)
Project Objective: Increase capacity at the	1.1.1. Degree of independent development and quality of national	1.1.1. National Focal points of the UNCCD and UNCBD need considerable support	1.1.1. The national reporting of the UNCCD and UNCBD implementation are	1.1.1. The capacities of the Nsec and/or National Focal points of the	1.1.1. National reports of the UNCCD and UNCBD in 2010,	The national governmental structure supports the national level	The inter-ministerial working group for NAP alignment is established. Fourth national

national and cross-country levels to develop and implement an integrated approach and strategies to combat land degradation within operational National Programming Framework⁸². Outcome 1: Enhanced policy coherence through mainstreaming of SLM principles into national policies and legislation to promote synergies with other	reports of the UNCCD and UNCBD.	from outside to prepare the national communications related to those conventions.	independently prepared by the respective Focal point and are of acceptable quality.	UNCCD and UNCBD to plan, implement and reporting directly related to the implementation of the conventions are strengthened by through Q12.	2011 and/or 2012.	coordination structures to foster UNCCD implementation.	communication on UNCCD is finalized and ready for printing.
	1.1.2. Success of the application of Tajikistan for financial support by the UNCCD Secretariat for the alignment process of the UNCCD NAP.	1.1.2. Documents needed for the application to the UNCCD Secretariat have not yet been prepared. The Government of Tajikistan is interested to revise the NAP accordingly.	1.1.2. Acceptance of the documents handed in for Tajikistan by the UNCCD Secretariat. Approval for financial support for the alignment process in the country by March 2012.	1.1.2. The UNCCD national working group is prepared for the UNCCD NAP alignment process by Q8.	1.1.2. Communication between the CEP and the UNCCD Secretariat.	The Tajik government remains interested in the alignment of the UNCCD NAP and actively supports the preparatory work.	NAP working group has produced a list of recommendations to update the NAP taking into consideration the emerging issues on forestry and pasture sectors.
	1.1.3. Level of participation of the UNCCD National Working Group and/or other key stakeholders responsible for promoting SLM in MCB project	1.1.3. No MCB project activities before the project start.	1.1.3. The UNCCD National Working Group and/or other key stakeholders responsible for promoting SLM are aware of and actively participate in MCB project activities.	1.1.3. Good coordination and working relationship with the Nsec and/or members of the UNCCD National Working Group and/or other key	1.1.3. Written communication, minutes from MCB project activities.	Related state agencies show the willingness to become aware of and/or actively participate in MCB Project activities.	Signed MOU with Committee for Environmental Protection and Ministry of Agriculture on mainstreaming the SLM principles into a new forest code, law on pasture and bylaws and instructions.

⁸² Or other national strategic documents in support in the implementation of the UNCCD

multilateral conservation agreements.	activities.			stakeholders responsible for SLM in Tajikistan through Q12.			
Output 1.1. Existing national structures for mainstreaming SLM into policy and legislation are strengthened	1.1.4 Quantity and quality of integration of SLM principles and approaches in the revised UNCCD NAP for Tajikistan.	1.1.4. Use of synergies with other Rio-conventions insufficient and SLM data and approaches partly out-dated.	1.1.4. The revised UNCCD NAP, IFS and IIF include SLM principles, approaches, project concepts and activities to use synergies with other relevant environmental conventions and integrates properly SLM principles and most important issues for the country.	1.1.4. SLM principles, approaches, project concepts and activities are properly included into the revised UNCCD NAP in Tajikistan by Q11.	1.1.4. Commented revised UNCCD NAP of Tajikistan.	The national governmental structures support integration of SLM principles into UNCCD NAP.	The list of recommendation for NAP alignment is produced. The certain para on pasture and IFS was mainstreamed.
Output 1.2. Approved strategy for enabling policy, legislative, and incentive structures to mainstream SLM and operationalize innovative	1.2.1. Existence and quality of a governmental program on sustainable pasture land management or on the improvement of soil fertility.	1.2.1. None of the two governmental programs exist.	1.2.1. At least one of the national programs are developed and approved and integrate SLM principles.	1.2.1. SLM principles properly integrated into at least one governmental program (e.g. on sustainable pasture land management or on the improvement of soil fertility) by Q11.	1.2.1. Approved governmental program(s).	The national governmental structures continue to be interested on working out a governmental program on sustainable pasture management and on improvement of soil fertility.	State Program on sustainable pasture management 2010 - 2015 is updated and approved by the Government of Tajikistan.

financing.	1.2.2. Amount of elaborated relevant laws and by-laws promoting SLM.	1.2.2. SLM principles are not properly included into the legislation of Tajikistan, especially with regard to forestry and pasture management.	1.2.2. At least one new or modified law (forest and/or pasture law) and 3 by-laws are elaborated and approved considering the SLM principles.	1.2.2. SLM principles properly integrated into at least one new law and at least one new by-law by Q10.	1.2.2. Drafted, approved and published laws and by-laws.	The national governmental structures support integration of SLM principles into the legislation.	<p>Project has established inter-ministerial working group and revised the forest code and Law on PAs, prepared a draft of the new law on Pastures, Bylaw on none timber forest product</p> <p>Updated rules on fire regulation in the forest sector</p> <p>Updated the forest cutting and wood making</p> <p>Updated rules for visitors</p> <p>Updated rules for haymaking</p> <p>Updated rules for grazing in the forest lands</p> <p>Updated rules to fight against pests and disease in the forests</p> <p>rules for collection and conservation of medicinal herbs and food plants within the forestry sites</p>
------------	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

							The SLM best practices are integrated into a new law on improving the livestock species.
	1.2.3. Inclusion of IFS, innovative best practices and approaches on SLM into revised UNCCD NAP of Tajikistan.	1.2.3. IFS innovative best practices and approaches on SLM are not (IFS) or insufficiently included in the UNCCD NAP.	1.2.3. At least significant features of the IFS and identified innovative best practices and approaches on SLM are integrated in the revised UNCCD NAP.	1.2.3. At least significant features of the IFS (SLM principles and especially incentive mechanisms) and identified SLM best practices, are included in the revised UNCCD NAP by Q11.	1.2.3. Revised UNCCD NAP after alignment process.		Application for NAP alignment and financing from GEF is finalized.
Output 1.3. Awareness of decision-makers of SLM goals, objectives and principles increased to facilitate mainstreaming of policies	1.3.1. Level of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies, which demonstrate awareness.	1.3.1. Awareness on collaborative SLM approaches within governmental structures in CA countries is low.	1.3.1. Awareness (and its change during the project phase) of key representatives of state level agencies on SLM is measured by Q12.	1.3.1. High level (>75%) of responses to awareness survey by State level agencies demonstrate awareness by Q12.	1.3.1. Results of awareness surveys at the national levels undertaken twice, at Q8 and Q12.	All targeted groups in awareness survey actively and honestly respond to survey questions.	The targeted groups within the project counterparts are well aware of SLM principles and supported.
	1.3.2. Participation of relevant decision makers in	1.3.2. Relevant decision makers often lack needed	1.3.2. Selected decision makers participate in at least one high level	1.3.2. Information materials developed and knowledge	1.3.2. Programs of the international		

	international high-level events directly linked with SLM mainstreaming.	means and information necessary to actively participate in high level international events directly linked with SLM mainstreaming.	international event directly linked with SLM mainstreaming with obvious relevance for Tajikistan.	building activities directly linked with SLM mainstreaming (e.g. national, regional and international events) implemented responding to the needs of decision-makers by Q12.	events with supported participation of selected decision makers. List of participants of those events.		
Outcome 2: Resources effectively mobilized to support SLM initiatives to promote synergies with other multilateral conservation agreements Output 2.1. National multi-stakeholder working group is established	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM are not defined.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 financial flows to SLM are known and included into IFS.	2.1.1. Determination of baseline financial flows to SLM.	2.1.1. Baseline yr. 2010 as included into IFS.	Positive overall financial situation.	GEF PPCR project is taking up the SLM issues addressed by the project.
	2.1.2. The amount of new national funding commitments for SLM.	2.1.2. No Integrated Financing Strategies exist in CA countries.	2.1.2. National funding commitments for SLM exceed baseline yr. financial flows by 12%.	2.1.2. Increase in baseline financial flows by 12% by Q12.	2.1.2. Published reports and confirmation on new and additional	Enough national and international donors willing to support SLM activities/projects.	SLM principles (sustainable forest and Pasture resource management is included into feasibility studies of GIZ). The SLM best practices are being disseminated and piloted within UNDP CRM project. The IFS is included into agrarian reform, state program on pastures are adopted by the Government to commit new financial

replete with knowledge, skills, and tools for developing IFSs.					financial flows to SLM.		flow into a pasture sector. A number of comments are made in order to make the IFS suitable to the agenda of Agrarian Reform.
	2.1.3. Availability of adapted IFS training module for conducting National DIFS workshop.	2.1.3. IFS training module is not adapted for Tajikistan conditions.	2.1.3. IFS training module is adapted to Tajik conditions.	2.1.3. Adaptation of training modules for IFS on national levels by Q6.	2.1.3. Adapted and published training modules for distribution.	Members of trained national IFS task groups remain active in the task groups.	The IFS is being aligned with the program of Agrarian reform and Ministry of Finance is taking this up according with the Governmental order.
	2.1.4. The number of persons qualified to develop IFS.	2.1.4. No qualified persons to develop IFS.	2.1.4. At least 30 persons trained on IFS methodology.	2.1.4. At least 30 persons trained in IFS methodology by Q6.	2.1.4. Record of participants of DIFS regional ToT and National workshops. Participants' evaluation of the TOT and National workshops.		
Output 2.2.	2.2.1. Status of	2.2.1. No IFS for	2.2.1. The IFS for	2.2.1. An Integrated	2.2.1. Developed	Proper support of	The IFS is finalized and

Integrated Financing Strategy drafted and endorsed by national stakeholders.	development and submission for approval of the IFS for Tajikistan.	Tajikistan in place.	Tajikistan developed and submitted for approval by ministry of economic development and Trade of the Republic of Tajikistan	Financing Strategy agreed and submitted for approval by appropriate national authorities by Q9.	and published IFSS.	the IFS development by national stakeholders. Sufficient data available for development of the IFS.	approved by the Ministry of Finance.
Output 2.3 SLM Integrated Investment Frameworks Developed.	2.3.1. Contents, volume and status of agreement with responsible governmental bodies of developed portfolio of synergetic project concepts as part of the National Integrated Investment Framework.	2.3.1. No SLM Investment Program responding with Integrated Financing Strategy developed.	2.3.1. The Integrated Investment Framework developed in accordance with Integrated Financing Strategy.	2.3.1. Nsec and/or UNCCD Focal Point are using IIF as the background for financing, and capacity building activities by Q10.	2.3.1. Integrated Investment Program.	Members of national IFS task groups remain in the task groups during development of Integrated Investment Frameworks and the project concepts.	<p>The IFS team remains committed to the development and implementation of new project concepts.</p> <p>7 project concepts are developed and agreed with UNCCD Focal Point</p> <p>In total 7 project concepts integrated into a list of content of the NAP UNCCD.</p> <p>Ministry of Finance is nominated as responsible agency for integration the</p>

							<p>principles of IFS into an agrarian reform.</p> <p>Several Comments into a IFS was done by GM consultant Ivan Ruzheka</p> <p>Final IFS meeting is conducting during agrarian reform meeting.</p>
Output 2.4: National SLM investment projects developed and submitted for financing.	2.4.1. Number of project concepts developed on the basis of Integrated Investment Framework and submitted for financing.	2.3.1. No Integrated Investment Framework in place.	2.3.1. At least 3 project concepts developed on the basis of the Integrated Investment Framework.	2.4.1. At least 3 project concepts developed on the basis of Integrated Investment Framework and submitted for financing by Q12.	2.4.1. Project concepts relevant for SLM in the country.		
Outcome 3. Improved interaction between state agencies and land users through human	3.1.1 Existence of a national CBU in Tajikistan.	3.1.1. No Tajikistan National CBU exists by Q1.	3.1.1. The National CBU established in Tajikistan with the national project team and involved experts.	3.1.1. CBU established within the national project team and involved experts to coordinate the SLM	3.1.1. Organogram of the MCB Project	<p>Sufficiently qualified experts apply for tendered CBU positions.</p> <p>CIM is able to mobilize needed</p>	<p>CBU is established.</p> <p>Although CIM expert has not been hired but the project had substantive support from regional CTA.</p>

resource development Output 3.1. National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plans and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders responsible for inter-action between state agencies and land users are integrated into relevant national strategic documents.				CB Programs by Q2.		funding for respective CIM positions in time.	
	3.1.2 Existence of a national short-term Capacity Building Action Plan.	3.1.2. No National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders is available.	3.1.2. Developed SLM national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities until 31 st of December 2011.	3.1.2. A National-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan and long-term Capacity Building priorities for SLM stakeholders developed by Q8.	3.1.2. Short-term Capacity Building Action Plans based on the MCB LogFrame and AWP.	National State organizations and NGOs are interested in recommendations for capacity building and actively participate in Capacity Building activities.	<p>Updated national short term, long term and exit strategy in the view of agrarian reform programme and capacity building scorecard.</p> <p>Local JRCs are substantively improved their knowledge and experience on SLM and financial outsourcing resulted on mobilization of community on resource use and got 60k from USAID, 64k from UNDP-GEF SGP, 15k from Norwegian Government through NGO "For the Earth".</p> <p>ADB project has co-financed in total 180k for national conferences and trainings on pasture and forest sectors. Has established 10 pasture user associations, developed pasture and</p>

							forest sector assessment with concrete action plans.
	3.1.3. Status of adaptation of the concept for the forestry system of Tajikistan and inclusion of priorities for capacity building measures.	3.1.3. The existing concept for the forestry system of Tajikistan is outdated and does not properly include priorities for capacity building on SLM.	3.1.3. A revised development concept for the forestry system of Tajikistan exists and includes clear capacity building priorities with relevance for SLM.	3.1.3. A national-level, short-term Capacity Building Action Plan for SLM stakeholders implemented through Q12.	3.1.3. Agendas for MCB Project activities, discussed with related stakeholders. Minutes of the MCB Project activities. Participants' evaluation of the MCB Project activities.		The national NGOs like CAMP Kuhiston, ADB project are well aware and started contribution to the SLM sectors. Conducted SLM forum in cooperation with CAMP Kuhiston and all project achievements including law on pastures are presented.
	3.1.4 Extent of inclusion of national strategic directions on capacity building for SLM into the revised UNCCD NAP of Tajikistan.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building priorities not integrated into National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. National-level long-term Capacity Building strategic directions and priorities are integrated into the National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.	3.1.4. A National-level long-term Capacity Building priorities integrated into the revised UNCCD NAP by Q11.	3.1.4. Prepared document - National Action Plan for the implementation of the UNCCD.		Fourth national communication is submitted to the Government for approval and further submission to the UNCCD secretariat. NAP alignment financial application is finalized and further submitted for GEF financing through UNDP.
Output 3.2. Mechanisms for	3.2.1 Availability of concrete	3.2.1. No draft of the Communication and	3.2.1. Main mechanisms for	3.2.1. A Communication and	3.2.1. Drafted plan(s) for	National stakeholders	Communication and coordination action plan is

communication and coordination between state organizations and land users are enhanced.	recommendations to improve communication and cooperation between state agencies (CEP; MoA) on pasture and forestry management.	coordination action plan in place.	improved communication and coordination between selected relevant state organizations are developed and discussed.	coordination action plan to improve communication and coordination between state agencies developed by Q8.	improvement of communication and coordination. Minutes of meetings to discuss and agree the plan.	support Communication and coordination action plan.	developed and agreed between Ministry of Agriculture and Committee for Environmental protection on allocating resources for sustainable pasture and forest management.
	3.2.2. Degree of integration of indentified needs for improvement of the communication and cooperation between selected state agencies and land user groups into the revised UNCCD NAP of Tajikistan.	3.2.2. Very weak integration in current UNCCD NAP.	3.2.2 Main recommendations for the improvement of the communication and cooperation between selected state agencies and land user groups are included into the revised UNCCD NAP.	3.2.2. A Communication and coordination action plan agreed by UNCCD working group meeting and implementation started by Q9.	3.2.2. Published National Action Plan.		Communication and coordination action plan is developed and agreed by Ministry of Agriculture and Committee for Environmental Protection.
Output 3.3. Modular training programmes designed and successfully implemented for professionals in state	3.3.1. Number of persons trained in modular training programmes.	3.3.1. No systematic trainings in improved Collaborative SLM modules, practices and principles.	3.3.1. At least 200 persons trained using Modular training programmes (e.g. sustainable use of medicinal herbs, wildlife, pastures, forests, soil and crop	3.3.1. Total of 200 persons trained using Modular training programmes (e.g. sustainable use of medicinal herbs, wildlife, pastures,	3.3.1. Published training modules for distribution. Record of participants. Participants' evaluation of the trainings.		Developed more than 13 training modules on sustainable use of medicinal herbs, wildlife, pastures, forests, soil and crop management and water conservation on organic farming and others

organisations and NGO to practise a collaborative approach in SLM.			management and water conservation on organic farming) involving trainers from Tajik Agrarian University and Tajik Agrarian Academy of Science.	forests, soil and crop management and water conservation on organic farming) by Q11.			<p>Developed manual on "Pastoral livestock breeding system in Tajikistan"</p> <p>Developed book on "Soil cartography" and being mainstreamed into education curriculum of Tajik Agrarian University.</p>
	3.3.2. Number of trainers trained on modular training courses on SLM.	3.3.2. Limited number of trainers trained in CA countries using Modular training programmes (e.g. collaborative land-use planning, Designing Integrated Financing Strategies, Participatory SLM Project Design Basics).	3.3.2. At least 8 trainers trained using Modular training programmes (e.g. collaborative land-use planning, Designing Integrated Financing Strategies, Participatory SLM Project Design Basics).	3.3.2. At least 8 trainers trained by Q10.	3.3.2. Record of participants. Participants' evaluation of the TOTs.		<p>In total 32 trainers within four target Jamoats have been trained on SLM issues.</p> <p>Conducted 32 working meetings in cooperation with SGP programme and JRC "Romit" on changing the status of protected area Romit into a biosphere reserve.</p> <p>5 representatives of protected area system in Tajikistan have improved</p>

							their knowledge on establishment and management of biosphere reserves through participation in international working workshop to Kyrgyzstan (Cooperation with SGP and JRC "Romit").
Outcome 4: Learning, dissemination and replication of best practices in collaborative SLM developed and strengthened. Output 4.1. Stakeholders relevant for SLM actively exchange thematic information and experiences.	4.1.1. Number of the national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	4.1.1. Not enough national level learning and consultative activities for promoting SLM best practices.	4.1.1. At least one exchange and consultative activity with a diverse group of relevant stakeholders is conducted.	4.1.1. The outreach to relevant stakeholders for SLM in Tajikistan in the frame of knowledge management is assured through Q12.	4.1.1. Minutes of the meetings with stakeholders.	Different stakeholders are interested and actively participate in learning and consultative activities.	In total 22 best practices are disseminated through ecological newsletter Navruzgoh Prepared a five success stories on CACILM MCB project and integrated into a UNDP EEP knowledge product. The principles of the law on pasture were published in the report of conducted SLM forum and disseminated to all participants.

Output 4.2. Learning and dissemination of best practices in SLM enhanced and strengthened among all relevant stakeholders.	4.2.1. Number of best practices documented at national level.	4.2.1. Best practices are not captured and documented at national level.	4.2.1. At least 6 best practices on SLM are documented for dissemination.	4.2.1. At least 6 SLM best practices identified, assessed, documented and disseminated at national level through Q12.	4.2.1. Documentations of best practices under WOCAT standard; other best practice documentations (information flyers; publications...)	The CACILM pilot projects produce results that are replicable to different regions or under different conditions. Willingness of different agencies, NGOs, or others to share information and results, especially failures.	The documented best practices are piloted by CRM project. The principles of pasture user's association is discussed with the representatives of the World Bank and integrated into a working plan of World Bank's GEF-PPCR project. Established 10 pasture users association with ADB project on pastures. Established one women CBO on sustainable use of medicinal and food plants. The principles of the law on pasture were published in the report of conducted SLM forum and disseminated to all participants. 6 documented best practices out of 68 are uploaded into WOCAT database and 22 of them are disseminated through Ecological newsletter
	4.2.2. Existence and quality of a dissemination strategy for the identified best practices at national level.	4.2.2. No systemic documentation of best practices and, hence, dissemination plans available.	4.2.2. A short term dissemination strategy for identified best practices including needed training modules is elaborated.	4.2.2. A dissemination strategy on SLM best practices to reach key target groups is developed and at least 3 respective trainings conducted by Q12.	4.2.2. Assessed and commented dissemination strategy.		
	4.2.3. Number of printed and distributed brochures, leaflets and training modules on the SLM	4.2.3. Limited number of printed and distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices	4.2.3. Learning products developed correspond to those as planned in the dissemination strategy and include outlines of	4.2.3. Appropriate learning products developed and disseminated through Q12.	4.2.3. Printed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices in up to three languages		

	best practices in up to three languages (Tajik, Russian, English).	on three languages (Tajik, Russian and English).	training modules (to be implemented under Outcome 3).		(Tajik, Russian and English). Reports on distributed brochures and prospects on the SLM best practices. List of training modules on best practices to be integrated under Outcome 3.		"Navruzgoh".
Output 4.3. Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.	4.3.1. Recommendations for the strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the MCB Project Board.	4.3.1. No strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed.	4.3.1. Recommendations for the strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed and approved by the MCB Project Board.	4.3.1. Recommendations for the Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices developed by Q10.	4.3.1. Developed Strategy for effective up-scaling and replication of SLM best practices. Minutes of the MCB Project Board Meeting.	Pilot projects and national initiatives providing lessons learned and suggestions for up-scaling. Resources for replication system secured.	The developed principles of sustainable pasture management are handed over to GEF PPCR project and ADB project on pastures. Target JRCs are scaling up the SLM best practices and principles. Documented 68 SLM best practices. 4 documented best practices are included into a planning system within
	4.3.2. A national lists of SLM best practices developed for dissemination on national or	4.3.2. No SLM best practices identified for dissemination on national or regional levels.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of good SLM practices / results by Q5.	4.3.2. Initial scoping of good SLM practices / results by Q5.	4.3.2. Reports on national working meetings to identify the list of SLM best practices		

	regional levels.				developed for dissemination.		target district authorities and forestry agency.
	4.3.3. Conduction of a national forum for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. No National Forums conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10.	4.3.3. A National Forum conducted for up-scaling and replication of best practices and lessons learnt by Q10.	4.3.3. Documentation from the National Forum. Information materials provided during the National Forums.		<p>Conducted one regional forum on WOCAT based documentation of best practices, and one national forum.</p> <p>Cooperated with CAMP and CDE on conducting international SLM Forum.</p> <p>Conducted one international conference on climate Change in cooperation with Academy of Science.</p>

Annex 5 List of MCB Publications

Turkmenistan:

2 monographs and two brochures published:

1. «Legal land regulations in Turkmenistan. Code of Turkmenistan on Land (in Russian and Turkmen languages);
2. «Sustainable land management. Analysis of status and development perspectives» (in Russian, Turkmen and English languages);
3. Brochure: «Collection of best practices on sustainable and efficient land use in Turkmenistan (in Russian);
4. Brochure: «Fireman field manual» (in Russian);
5. Monograph: «Natural pastures and development of distant pasture cattle of Turkmenistan» (in Russian);

12 colored booklets published in Russian and English languages:

- «Fixation and afforestation of blown sands around settlements in the Central Karakum»,
- «Planting of bamboo reed as a wind protector and its using in households»,
- «Soil salinity prevention»,
- «Recovery of high degraded wastelands»,
- «Field even wetting through furrow irrigation»,
- «Improving mountainous pastures»,
- «Методы простого капельного орошения для мелкоозисного земледелия»,
- «Using rainwater run-off for irrigation in households»,
- «Techniques to grow seedlings of fruit and ornamental trees with closed root system»,
- «Methodological recommendations for growing Turkmen juniper seedlings»
- «Methodological recommendations for almond and grafting in nurseries»,
- «Methodological recommendations for yield increase of pistachio by grafting.

Kyrgyzstan:

Publication:

1. Training manual: «Sustainable use of herbs of Kyrgyzstan» - 136 p.
2. Laboratory and field practicum on herbs of Kyrgyzstan»-188 p.
3. Catalogue: «Water saving soil protection innovations» - 68 p. (in Kyrgyz language)
4. Guideline: «Irrigation basis in Kyrgyzstan» -102 p.
5. Types of forests and its sustainable use.

Laws and bylaws:

1. Agro-industrial complex Strategy Development for 2012-2020
2. State Program on conservation and soil fertility improvement in the Kyrgyz Republic 2012-2015
3. Law on pasture
4. Amendments to the law on pastures of the Kyrgyz Republic
5. Provisions on development community plan for pasture management and use and annual pasture use plan
6. Rules of surface water protection of the Kyrgyz Republic.

Kazakhstan:

1. Materials of the Republican scientific –practical seminar "Readiness and use of forces and means for forests and steppe fires" – 18 p.
2. Materials of round table "Problems and ways of sustainable pasture use" – 134 p.
3. Fourth national report of the Republic of Kazakhstan on implementing UN Convention to combat desertification – 134 p.

Tajikistan:

1. Collection of best practices on land use – 195 p.
2. Book on laws -431 p (in Tajik language)
3. Forest genetic resources of Tajikistan -132 p.
4. SLM review in Tajikistan – 53 p.

Laws and bylaws:

1. Pasture Law of
2. Law on protected areas
3. Forest Code
4. Collection and use of non timber forest product
5. Roles and liabilities of forester and hunters for forest management

Instructions:

1. Updated rules for visitors;
2. Updated rules for grazing in the forest lands
3. Updated the forest cutting and wood making
4. Rules for collection and conservation of medicinal herbs
5. Updated rules to fight against pests and disease in the forests
6. Rules for hunting
7. Updated rules on fire regulation in the forest sector

Uzbekistan:

1. Manual on livestock – 44 p (in Uzbek language)
2. Legislation laws and normative documents on land use in the Republic of Uzbekistan – 126 p. (in Russian and Uzbek)
3. Updated irrigation methods and land improvement for agriculture in arid zones with minimal water – 52p.
4. Field farmer's schools in irrigated area– 12 p.
5. Economic assessment of activities on sustainable livestock and land degradation in desert regions of Uzbekistan – 24 p.
6. Practical veterinary recommendations to farmers on prevention and animal diseases -44p. (in Uzbek)
7. Recommendations on rational pasture use and increase its productivity – 48 p.
8. Problems of land desertification and ways of their solution in Uzbekistan – 63 p.
9. Rational use of feed – 26 p.
10. Training material on pasture– 42 p. (Uzbek language).

Annex 6 Resume of FE Team

Francis Hurst has a BSc. in Zoology and a MSc. in Conservation. He has worked in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management and natural resource management for over 20 years with practical experience of managing protected areas, policy, and planning, sustainable use and natural resource governance. His main interest is in CBNRM and sustainable use. For the past 20 years he has worked as an independent consultant in more than 27 countries including UNDP-GEF, UNEP-GEF and EU midterm and final/terminal evaluations in Uzbekistan, Georgia, Turkey, Egypt, Russia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, China, Montenegro and Botswana.

Maya Eralieva completed her higher education at the Department of International Relations, Kyrgyz National State University in 2001. Maya is interested in sustainable development, doing research, analysis and advocacy on International Financial Institutions; accountability and transparency of IFIs policies, projects and programs; Democratization of Development process. She has 6 years expertise in project, policy and program monitoring of international financial institution (ADB, WB, EBRD) operations in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Since 2007, Maya has been working with NGO Forum on ADB as Senior Management Team member of the leading international civil society network monitoring the Asian Development Bank. After the 2005 revolution in the Kyrgyz Republic, Maya worked as Secretary for the Constitutional Council initiated by Kyrgyz civil society groups and supported by Parliament. Early 2001, she also helped coordinate natural and cultural heritage projects while working at National Commission of the Kyrgyz Republic for UNESCO.

Tulkin Radjabov has a BA in International Relations and BA in Accounting and Audit. He has worked in institutional development, capacity building and areas for more than 10 years encompassing practical experience of project management, policy and planning, resource mobilization and public relations. He has been working as a project manager in a number of OSCE and UNDP project in the area of good governance, environmental security.

Khushbakht Hojiev

Annex 7 Comments by stakeholder on First Draft report

Annex 7: Stakeholders’ Comments to First Draft Evaluation Report and Response from Evaluation Team Final Evaluation of the “UNDP-GEF project “CACILM: Multi-country Capacity Building Project”

PIMS 3231 SLM FSP

STAKEHOLDERS’ COMMENTS ON FIRST DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT

Ref. number and initiator	COMMENT (with page and initial of commentator)	CONSULTANT’S REPLY
Para. 27, Uzbekistan	UZ comments: I would add footnote [10] for Uzbekistan as well as “The UNCCD Focal Point is housed within the Uzhydromet. As a result the CBU in Uzbekistan had very established a very good partnership with this Ministry”	Included as footnote
Para. 84, Kyrgyzstan.	NC in KG: MCB KG initiated a revision of the existing pasture law by expanding the list of involved stakeholders.	Agreed. Sentence now reads (with footnote): <i>An example of this has been the development of the pasture laws in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan and, at a very early stage, in Turkmenistan. While the MCB was not directly responsible for the development of the Kyrgyz Law on Pastures it has facilitated a process of revision, expanded the list of involved stakeholders and included SLM in a range of strategic normative documents⁸³ that is aligned to a broader reform process taking place within the country.</i>
Para. 84, Kyrgyzstan.	NC in KG: actually, this was a locomotive in promoting of SLM principles into the strategic documents at the decision making level.	
Para. 86, RPMU	As a result the IFS(s) are not yet approved at the national levels or they cannot be approved or recognized with the present form and draft. They were not approved as Strategy to be implemented by government. Therefore, the RPMU strongly recommended the IFS Team to look for any relevant government owned strategies to include the IFSs into them. It was clear that as “stand alone” document, implementation of the IFS did not seem possible. Thus, the IFS were accepted by different ministries and agencies and some parts of it mainstreamed into national strategic papers (green development in KZ, agrarian reform in TJK etc).	Agreed. Para., now reads: <i>As a result the IFS(s) are not yet approved at the national levels or they cannot be approved or recognized with the present form and draft as a strategy to be implemented by Government(s). However, on the recommendation of the RPMU the IFS teams looked for alternative relevant government-owned strategies and to try to integrate the IFS into these. As a result, the IFS were accepted by different ministries and agencies and some parts of it are mainstreamed into national strategic papers</i>

⁸³ Mainstreaming in “GEF speak”

		<i>(e.g. Green Development in Kyrgyzstan, the agrarian reform in Tajikistan, etc.).</i>
Para 89, Kyrgyzstan & Tajikistan	<p>TJK- Indeed, we had not that much cooperation with PALM project, though only one time the representative of PALM made presentation during pasture law public hearing meeting and that was the only time we had cooperation with PALM project though a number of invitations was sent for the meeting to discuss the draft of the law on pastures.</p> <p>KG part – As I have reported earlier, we’ve initiated two meetings with PALM reps to identify entry points for our projects but PALM was passive by saying that they were coming to an end. However, they were invited to participate at different working groups (pasture law, IFS, etc) under the MCB projects, as well we were invited to attend their closing conference last year.</p>	<p>Agreed. Para., now reads: <i>The FE is not able to ascertain why there appears to have been little collaboration between these two projects however, the FE feels that the reasons did not lie in the MCB project</i></p>
Para. 106, RPMU	<p>The partnerships arrangements described in the Project Document were heavily dependent upon the CACILM structures being in place. Given that nineteen months had passed between the development of the project proposal and the project start up it may seem unfair to criticise the Project Document because the CACILM framework was no longer in place to coordinate these arrangements. However, it should still have been possible to govern the project through the PSC. The role of the PSC is to provide the executive for the project; it should have governed the project and served as its accountable body, ensuring that there was a clear vision, mission, values, and policies; and that they are properly respected. Had the PSC had very clear ToR and rules governing meetings it is may have been possible to avoid many of the problems that have beset the project. However, these were not provided in the Project Document and as so often appear to be the case, it is generally too late to establish this after the project has started there are different opinions on this, contradicting each other. <i>May better not to mention why it was not signed and instead to recommend to sign such a MOU in the beginning of the project.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. The point is made that it is too late to do this after the project has begun</p>
Table 4, RPMU	<p>National short term capacity building action plans have been drafted and partly implemented by the MCB project in Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, <i>Tajikistan and Kazakhstan as well. Could you please cross-check your records?</i></p>	<p><i>Now reads: Satisfactory: Five action plans approved and partially implemented. However, the indicator is not a reasonable measure of the project’s impact</i></p>
Table 4, RPMU	<p>All five countries have developed IFS(s) however none have been approved by governments and it is likely to be difficult to approve them because mechanism how to incorporate the IFS into UNCCD NAP or any other national strategic documents not clear or no such mechanisms exists. Furthermore, there is little experience of financial strategies in the region</p>	<p><i>Agreed, now reads: All five countries have developed IFS(s) however none have been approved by governments and it is likely to be difficult to approve them because mechanism how to incorporate the IFS into UNCCD NAP or any other national strategic documents not clear or no such</i></p>

	<p>and it will take time for governments to fully understand them in a way that they can be meaningfully integrated into the broader planning framework. The IFS were endorsed by different agencies and NSEC (in Uzbekistan) but they were not approved and accepted as standalone strategies to inflow funds into SLM sector. Following adaptive management, the RPMU strongly recommended to mainstream the main sections of IFS into any relevant national strategic documents to ensure follow up and possible implementation. (mainstreamed into green economy in KZ, agrarian sector reform in TJK, NAP in KG, etc). more details brought in above sections.</p>	<p><i>mechanisms exists. Furthermore, there is little experience of financial strategies in the region and it will take time for governments to fully understand them in a way that they can be meaningfully integrated into the broader planning framework. The IFS were endorsed by different agencies and NSEC (in Uzbekistan) but they were not approved and accepted as standalone strategies to inflow funds into SLM sector. Following adaptive management, the RPMU strongly recommended to mainstream the main sections of IFS into any relevant national strategic documents to ensure follow up and possible implementation. (mainstreamed into green economy in KZ, agrarian sector reform in TJK, NAP in KG, etc.) more details brought in above sections.</i></p>
Table 4, Kyrgyzstan	<p>Regional Dare to Share in Nov. 2012 with participation of high level decision makers from each country except Turkmenistan; international experts' participation as well as participation of practitioners and experts from each country. Exchange of information and experiences on thematic areas of forest, pasture and wildlife management as well as water management and adaptation to climate change. Donors meeting in the frame of this event proved to become a platform for concrete commitments for a second phase of CACILM. Conference part of the event provided in-depth insight into CACILM 1 results and lessons learnt, launch of a regional SLM platform as well as future perspectives of the CACILM initiative.</p> <p>Support of the organization of the Global WOCAT Conference in Kyrgyzstan in 2011.</p> <p>Support of and participation in a global pastoralism conference in 2011 in Kyrgyzstan.</p> <p>Co-organizing and participation in a regional pasture management conference in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 2011.</p> <p>KG: Support of the 1st National Forum on Organic Agriculture in Kyrgyzstan, December 2012</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>
Table 4, RPMU	<p>For Uzbekistan: 6 trainings on best practises were conducted and 6 events were organised with giving presentations of BP to stakeholders</p> <p>National Forum was planned as final event for the Project in Uzbekistan but not conducted. Two events dedicated to International Combat Desertification Day were conducted with participation of wide range of</p>	<p>All included in Final Draft</p>

	<p>stakeholders in 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>National level – 8 in KG</p> <p>National - 4: 1. National Forum on building network among the SLM organizations, December 2010</p> <p>2. National workshop on best practices for WOCAT, May 2011</p> <p>3. National workshop for community radio, April 2011, September 2012</p> <p>4. The I National Forum on Organic Agriculture, December 2012</p> <p>22 trainings in TJK</p> <p>TKM</p> <p>5 trainings at national level and 5 at regional level.</p>	
Table 4, RPMU	<p>In KG: National - 4: 1. National Forum on building network among the SLM organizations, December 2010</p> <p>2. National workshop on best practices for WOCAT, May 2011</p> <p>3. National workshop for community radio, April 2011, September 2012</p> <p>4. The I National Forum on Organic Agriculture, December 2012</p> <p>, 1 in TKM</p> <p>National Forum was planned as final event for the Project in Uzbekistan but not conducted. Two events dedicated to International Combat Desertification Day were conducted with participation of wide range of stakeholders in 2011 and 2012.</p>	All now included
Uzbekistan, para 51	The Project PDF B84: Is it possible to explain somewhere what these separate blocks of project development facilities mean, please?	Unfortunately the space available does not allow an explanation of the separate funding blocks. In short the PDF is the Project Development Fund provided for establishing the baseline, and designing the project
Uzbekistan, para 51	The meaning of this part is not clear to me. What do we refer to by saying 3 years after Terminal Evaluation?	Agreed, the confusing line was an error and has been deleted
Uzbekistan, para 106	The role of the PSC is to provide the executive for (is this Guidance / governance?)	It is both but the PSC should be the primary decision-making body for the project. This is why they (Steering Committees) are so important, and also why they very often prove

⁸⁴ Project Development Fund (conceptual and design period of the Project)

		ineffective. If they merely offer guidance then this can be ignored. The Project Manager (RPM in this instance) should be accountable to the PSC. Sentence now includes “(as well as guidance)”
Tajikistan, para 20	In the mid-2011, the project staff had passed through two big Team building and Stakeholder dialogue meetings which used to be very useful event but in regards the late timeframe conducted it could not change the curve of the project direction much but at least brought up a useful networking and further clarity over the implementation approach on project sustainability.	The FE broadly agrees with this statement but considers what the project might have looked like had these exercises not been carried out. This is an important point which should be considered in the development of future projects and the FE considers that this is probably one of the benefits of UNDP partnering with GIZ. Given the difficult beginning these interventions probably saved the project or at least have meant that it has ended on a satisfactory note. GEF projects are highly complex and the lesson may be that even high quality project personnel will need to take on new skills for their effective implementation.
Tajikistan, para 21	What about the Forest code where the principles of Joint Forest Management was mainstreamed, what about the law on PA which made it possible to enhance the status of PA, improved the financing from the state as well as contains the principles how to change the status of PAs into a biosphere reserves using the joint community participation in the planning.	Agreed wholeheartedly, these were significant events that took place in Tajikistan, as they have in the four other countries and it highlights the difficulties in monitoring and evaluating a multi-country project and reporting on the outcomes. GEF evaluations reports are intended to be 35 pages in length plus annexes. This may be feasible in a simple, single issue project but SLM is not a science, it would be easier to say that it is a philosophy except that that causes of land degradation and the solutions often provided are hardly the result of rational thinking. This report has overshoot the required 35 pages and has managed to “get away with it”. The individual detail of the country success is captured in Annex 4 which contains the approximately 69 pages of country LFM's against results.
Tajikistan, Table summarizing ratings, UNDP & Implementing Partner implementation/execution, coordination and operational issues	I think we can also mention about the human resource problem that the project has faced because of careless behaviour of the previous RPM and in spite of that the project had effectively acted to each it's annual and overall targets. Thus, I would propose to have “Satisfactory” but will leave to the judgment of FE.	The FE has some sympathy with this viewpoint but cannot overlook the fact that the project drifted for a long time in the early years before action was taken and when action was taken the project operated without a RPM for many months. The FE is tasked with assessing project performance over the entirety of its life. However, the FE will consider how this effects the overall rating of the

		project and if it means that there is a less than satisfactory rating we may consider changing this to reflect the overall success.
Tajikistan, para. 66	The Project could have come up with a good and parallel project thematic directions like Pasture and Forest management in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, Pasture in Kazakhstan and Agriculture management in Uzbekistan and etc. We had not a concrete thematic topic for the projects at each CA country rather than not to spend the resources to cover the whole SLM problems in CA but select one or two priority problems and make the focused resource allocation.	The FE broadly agrees with this comment but adds that it might not have been possible at the time of design to have focused in on a number of themes and it reflects the interconnectedness of issue in achieving SLM. Furthermore, it might not have been possible, at the time, to get a five-country agreement because of the rights issues associated with many of the these reforms. It also demonstrates the risk that the FE has touched on that the project could have become a grant dispersal mechanism for micro-projects with tenuous links to SLM (which it appears to have avoided). Certainly this is an issue that should be considered in any future project design.
Tajikistan, para 82	Along with documenting a best practices, the MCB project in Tajikistan has articulated its own best practices like water harvesting on the rain fed areas, grafting of pear with hawthorn which was a pure best practices generated by the MCB project.	These individual country successes are captured in Annex 4
Tajikistan, para. 91	The misunderstanding was also related to the TOR of National Coordinators, according with the TOR, the NCs were supposed to act like Technical experts only who are responsible for implementation only but in reality the NCs are acted like five project managers who have been developing LFM and AWP at countries level.	Agreed. Para 107 now reads: “Furthermore, the ToR for the National Coordinators were developed with them acting as Technical Advisers rather than Project Managers. In the event their roles emerged as project managers developing the country LFMs and AWP. It is reasonable to expect this difference between a technical expert and project manager should have been anticipated in the project’s design”. Once again this highlights the error of not having a substantive RPM in place to drive these issues and take ownership.
Tajikistan, para 122	We had no any concrete recommendation for improvement of LFM by the MTE.	Agreed and this is some of the basis for the FE’s criticisms of the MTR. It appears to have lacked the authority to make the changes and the recommendations were weak
Tajikistan, Table 4	Although the CB score card was conduct later than it was supposed to be conducted by at CA countries the CB need assessments were conducted to improve the capacity as well as come up with the good actions to fill up the	Agreed, however, this does not provide an indicator of effectiveness. These may be good suggestions but it will not tell us whether it has worked. Indeed the score card is a

	coordination and communication amongst the targeted stakeholders.	very good scorecard, very satisfactory, but it was run only one time and some distance into the project
Tajikistan, Table 4	Can we change it to the highly satisfactory, if to assess the economic efficiency of the project in terms of new law has been enacted in Tajikistan which could serve to a greater income regulations for the state from the clear regulation of forest and pasture resources which may turn over with huge incomes regulated for the benefit of the state and can over cost the project allocated resources in terms of good resource management later on and income for the state from such activity may triple its benefit.	Agreed, on the basis that these carefully crafted interventions will have far ranging impacts on the management of pastures. It is by no means the full measures that will need to be taken but they have laid the foundations for future interventions. It is also important to note that the progress appears not to have been uniform across all countries but this should reflect the status of transition in governance systems and should not detract from the projects efforts. Changed in the text of the Final Draft.
Tajikistan, Table 4	The principles of Joint Forest Management was also worked out by UNDP Shaartuz SLM project which has a number of comparative advantage with the one principle proposed by GIZ in GBAO, in reality the principles of JFM developed by the Shaatrutz SLM project is much community driven than in the principle developed by GIZ, since the methods of GIZ JFM is based on the principle of establishment of individual but not stress the principles of common pool resource management.	The FE is cautious in commenting on this other than to say that the Shaatuz SLM project brought a body of experience from Uzbekistan and the progress that it made with the community forest management might well have been dependent upon the work already done by GIZ. It underlines the importance of a collaborative approach between donors.

Annex 8 Declaration

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹

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

Name of Consultant: Francis Hurst

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): N/A

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

Signed at Lisboa, Portugal on 1st November 2012

Signature: Francis Hurst

¹www.unevaluation.org/unecodeofconduct