

Terms of Reference
for
Independent Final Project Evaluation
(National Consultant)

**Integrating Global Environmental Issues into Bulgaria's Regional Development
Process (Rio Conventions Project)**
Project 51783
PIMS 3333

I. Background information on the project

I. 1. General Context

The GEF-funded Rio Conventions Project (full title: ***Integrating Global Environmental Issues into Bulgaria's Regional Development Process***) aims at promoting a proactive integration of global environmental issues into the very process of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning, both of which are managed by Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works (MRDPW). This would be achieved by developing the capacity of MRDPW and Ministry of Environment and Water (MOEW) to integrate global environmental objectives into the regional and local development policies and practices, as well as into spatial planning documents.

Based on the findings of the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) and subsequent discussions with key stakeholders during the PDF-A, the project strategy is to promote a proactive integration of global environmental issues into the very process of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning, both of which are managed by MRDPW. This would be achieved by developing the capacity of MRDPW to integrate global environmental objectives into the regional and local development policies and practices, as well as into spatial planning documents.

To implement the project strategy, it will be essential to involve and build ownership of the project among the following key stakeholder groups – MRDPW at all levels, MOEW, Municipal Mayors, local NGOs and private enterprises. All of these groups are essential to influencing and changing the current practice in terms of how regional and local development and spatial planning documents are formulated and implemented. A particularly important opportunity that this project is capitalizing on is the interest expressed by MRDPW to pursue such an approach during their involvement in the NCSA process. The project strategy will be realized through the following 3 outcomes:

OUTCOME 1: The methodologies, skills, knowledge, and information management system for mainstreaming global environmental considerations into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of regional development and spatial planning policies are in place

OUTCOME 2: Institutional changes that support mainstreaming of global environmental into regional development and spatial planning are in place.

OUTCOME 3: Regional development plans and municipal-level spatial development plans are revised to integrate global environmental objectives in a pilot region or group of municipalities through application of capacities developed in Outcomes 1 and 2.

So far the project has been subject to one independent evaluation – Mid-term evaluation from the end of 2008. The overall evaluation of the project was “*Satisfactory*”. Along with this, the implementation approach and effectiveness of the project were evaluated as *Satisfactory*, as was the outlook for the sustainability of the project. Some of the main recommendations from the MTE included:

- It is recommended that the project management team put more focus on long-term sustainability and institutionalization of project achievements. Long-term impact and long-term sustainability are closely related and are ultimately the main drivers for the success of a project. All achievements should be well institutionalized within the Bulgarian system;
- It is recommended to promote the 60-hours training programme within the public sector, the civil society and the private sector. Some project resources are used to deliver the programme to 130 Officers as per the MOU between the MRDPW and MOEW. However, in parallel to this training delivery, the project should focus on creating a demand for this course;
- It is recommended a stronger partnership to implement the demonstration. One of the first tasks should be to set-up a working group to oversee the implementation of the demonstration (outcome #3), including representatives of key national institutions such as MRDPW, MOEW, EEA but also key representatives from the district and municipal level such as Governors, Mayors, Planners, Environmental Officers, etc.. Ideally, the partnership should include a co-financing of the demonstration;
- It is recommended that the project support the review and the revision of the methodological guidelines (currently underway) for regional development planning to ensure that all project findings so far are integrated into these guidelines. It is an important milestone for mainstreaming the conventions obligations into the formulation and implementation of regional and local development plans. Following the new Law on regional development, these guidelines need to be revised; again this is an excellent opportunity for the project to institutionalize these obligations into the official methodological guidelines to produce these local development plans.

The management response to these and other recommendations will be included in the documents package to be provided to the consultant.

II. Final Evaluation – introduction, evaluation audience, objectives and scope, expected products

II.1. Introduction

The independent Final Evaluation will take place at the end of project implementation, focusing on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation, but with special emphasis on identification of the degree of strengthened capacities of MRDPW to integrate global environmental concerns into development. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the potential for achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities.

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy (<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1904>) and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://www.undp.org/gef/monitoring/policies.html>).

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP-GEF has four objectives: (i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; (ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; (iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and (iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

In accordance with UNDP-GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects.

II.2. Evaluation audience

This Final Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Bulgaria CO as the Implementation Agency for the Rio Conventions project. UNDP-GEF is primarily interested in analysis of how successful implementation of the project has been, what impacts it has generated, if the project benefits will be sustainable in the long-term and what the lessons learnt are for future interventions in the country, region and other parts of the globe where UNDP-GEF provides its assistance.

II.3. Evaluation objectives and scope

This evaluation is expected to provide professional assessment of the project implementation successfulness against the set objectives and indicators, including contribution of the project to achieving global environmental benefits. The evaluation will also collate and analyze lessons learned and best practices obtained during the period of the project implementation that can be further taken into consideration during development and implementation of other GEF projects in Bulgaria and elsewhere in the world.

Specifically this final evaluation has the following objectives:

- (i) to analyze and evaluate effectiveness of the results and impacts that the project has been able to achieve against the objective, targets and indicators stated in the project document;
- (ii) to assess effectiveness of the work and processes undertaken by the project as well as the performance of all the partners involved in the project implementation;

- (iii) to provide feedback and recommendations for subsequent decision making and necessary steps that need to be taken by the national stakeholders in order to ensure sustainability of the project's outcomes/results;
- (iv) to reflect on how effective the use of available resource has been use; and
- (v) to document and provide feedback on lessons learned and best practices generated by the project during its implementation.

III. Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English.

III.1. Contents

The evaluation report should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive summary
 - Brief description of the project
 - Context and purpose of the evaluation
 - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Introduction
 - Project background
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Key issues addressed
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation
- The Project and its development context
 - Project start and its duration
 - Problems that the project seek to address
 - Goal, Objective and outcomes of the project Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
- Findings and conclusions
 - Project formulation
 - Project Implementation
 - Project Results
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Annexes: TOR, itinerary, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

More detailed break down of the evaluation report into sections and ratings is given in Annex 1.

III.2. Additional notes to the report

Formatting:	Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of contents (automatic); page numbers (centred); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.
Length:	maximum 30 pages in total excluding annexes
Timeframe of submission:	first draft: four days after the end of the in-country mission; second draft: two days after receiving comments from Rio Conventions Project Management Unit, UNDP Bulgaria, Government Counterparts; final draft: two days after receiving comments from Rio Conventions Project Management Unit, UNDP Bulgaria, Government Counterparts and UNDP/GEF Bratislava
Should be submitted to:	UNDP Bulgaria

If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

IV. Methodology or evaluation approach

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group¹). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

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

- Documentation review (desk study) - the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in **Annex 2** to this Terms of Reference and these will be provided in advance by the Project Implementation Unit;
- Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP Bulgaria, Rio Conventions Project Management Unit, Project

¹ See <http://www.uneval.org/>

Steering Committee members, National Project Director, Sofia University, selected consultants involved in key project assignments after the Mid-term Evaluation;

- Field visit (an indicative schedule attached in **Annex 3**);
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The consultant should also provide **ratings** of Project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria. Aspects of the Project to be rated are

1	Implementation approach
2	Country ownership/drivers
3	Outcome/Achievement of objectives (meaning the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved)
4	Stakeholder participation/public involvement
5	Sustainability
6	Replication approach
7	Cost-effectiveness
8	Monitoring and evaluation

The ratings to be used are:

HS	Highly Satisfactory
S	Satisfactory
MS	Marginally Satisfactory
MU	Marginally Unsatisfactory
U	Unsatisfactory
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory
NA	Not applicable

V. Evaluation team – qualifications and requirements

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluation team will be composed of one International Team Leader and one National Consultant. The evaluators shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former cooperation with GEF is an advantage.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

- (i) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- (ii) Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- (iii) Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- (iv) Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- (v) Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- (vi) Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to capacity development natural resource management, spatial planning and regional development projects;
- (vii) Recognized expertise in the cross-cutting area of environmental protection and regional development / spatial planning;
- (viii) Familiarity with regional development, spatial planning policies and administrative-territorial division in Bulgaria is an asset;
- (ix) Demonstrable analytical skills;
- (x) Work experience in relevant areas (regional development and spatial planning, environmental management and planning, SEA) for at least 10 years;
- (xi) Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported capacity development projects;
- (xii) Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- (xiii) Excellent English communication skills.

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore, evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project will not be considered. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the Rio Project's policy-making process and/or delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Project Administration, MRDPW, MoEW, UNDP Bulgaria or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

VI. Evaluation team – specific tasks

The International Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Specifically, the International Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Assist Rio Conventions Project Management Unit in drafting terms of reference of the Additional Consultant(s)
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;

- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report.

The National Consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the International Team Leader with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the National Consultant will perform tasks with a focus on:

- Review documents;
- Prepare a list of the outputs achieved under project;
- Organize the mission programme and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
- Assist Team Leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles²:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

VII. Implementation Arrangements

VII.1. Management arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Bulgaria. UNDP Bulgaria will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. UNDP Bulgaria and Rio Conventions Project Management Unit will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

² See p.16 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

VII.2. Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines

The evaluation will be completed in the period from 5 July to 3 September 2010. The report shall be submitted to the UNDP Bulgaria office.

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, project team and UNDP Bulgaria and UNDP/GEF Bratislava. If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

The activity and timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Timeframe and responsible party
Desk review	3 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant
Briefings for evaluators	1/2 day by the Rio Conventions Project Management Unit/ UNDP
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings	4 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant
Preparation of first draft report	4 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant
Review of preliminary findings with project stakeholders through circulation of the draft report for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms	14 days Rio Conventions Project Management Unit, UNDP Bulgaria and Government Counterparts
Incorporation of comments from project stakeholders and submission of second draft report	2 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant
Review and preparation of comments to second draft report	14 days Rio Conventions Project Management Unit, UNDP Bulgaria, Government Counterparts and UNDP/GEF Bratislava
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on second draft)	2 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant

Working Days:

Team Leader – 15 working days

National Consultant – 15 working days

The proposed dates for the in-country mission of the Team Leader to Bulgaria are 12th to 15 July 2010. The assignment is to commence no later than 5 July, 2010.

All interested applicants should submit: a recent CV; a brief outline of the evaluation approach and methodology; period of availability, a proposed budget for the assignment implementation to: evaluation@rioconventions.org. **Application deadline: 27 June 2010.**

Annex 1. Preliminary content of the final evaluation report

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

4.1. Project Formulation

- Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
- Country-ownership/Driveness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
- Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
- Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
- Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects

and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:
 - i. The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.
 - ii. Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
 - iii. The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
 - iv. The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
 - v. Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
- Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
- Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:
 - i. The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
 - ii. Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
 - iii. The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
 - iv. Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.
- Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:
 - i. The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
 - ii. The cost-effectiveness of achievements
 - iii. Financial management (including disbursement issues)
 - iv. Co-financing³

³ Please see guidelines in **Annex 5** of these TORs for reporting of co-financing.

- Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.
- Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoU and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

4.3. Results

- Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R): Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established⁴.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff.

5. Recommendations

- Corrective actions that need to be undertaken in order to retain and strengthen achieved results, in design of the future GEF supported projects, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the projects
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Lessons learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

^{4 4} Please review the project updated Logical Framework **in Annex 4** of these TORs.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Others.

Annex 2. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

General documentation

UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results

UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit

Project documentation

Original Project Document

Project Inception Report

Original and Revised Log-Frame document

UNDP Annual Reports (2007, 2008, 2009)

Project Implementation Reviews (2007, 2008, 2009)

Project Tracking Tools tracking tools for the project

Project Benchmark Documents

UNDP Quarterly Project Reports

Examples of Monthly Reports

Steering Committee and Advisory Board Meeting minutes

Training package Documentation

Mid-Term Evaluation Report and Management Response

Documentations relevant to the project-developed and pilot tested Seven Strategic Indicators for integration of global environmental issues into regional development processes, including the developed technical and GIS “passports” for the indicators, development of a prototype GIS for monitoring of the indicators at MRDPW, the integration of the indicators in the pilot update of one District Development Strategy in Bulgaria.

Annex 3. Indicative in-country field mission schedule

Field mission is expected to be completed in July 2010. Indicative breakdown is presented below however this could be subject to additional agreements with selected consultants.

12-15 July, 2010

12 July /Monday / - meeting with project staff and project collaborators

13 July /Tuesday/ - meeting with project SC members from MRDPW and MoEW

14 July /Wednesday/ - meeting with project collaborators from academic institutions, NGOs and consultants

15 July /Thursday/ –wrapping up of collected information debriefing of project staff

Appendix 4 – Logical Framework of the Project

Project Goal					
To embed global environmental concerns into the processes of regional and local development, and spatial planning in Bulgaria.					
Objective/ Outcomes	Indicator	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Target</i>	Sources of verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Project Objective: To build capacities for mainstreaming global environment into the formulation and implementation of regional and local development, as well as spatial planning policies.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: New GE sensitive guidelines, for national, regional and municipality planning are adopted by the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works. (Final target: N/A)</p>	<p>GE sensitive guidelines are not in place</p>	<p>Guidelines adopted by mid 2009</p>	<p>MRDPW adopts Methodological Guidelines in accordance with art. 20 (8) from RDA Project reports.</p>	<p>GOB remains committed to integrating global environmental considerations into regional development and spatial planning processes. MRDPW remains the key responsible Ministry for implementing the RDA and TDA MRDPW and MOEW continue to cooperate closely to ensure appropriate integration of environmental issues in regional development</p>
	<p>Indicator 2: Percentage of projects under the OPRD funded after 2008, which contain GE indicators relevant to the individual projects, as well as report on them. (Final target⁵: N/A)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>80% of projects under the OPRD funded after 2008 contain GE indicators relevant to the individual projects, as well as report on them</p>	<p>Information System for Monitoring and Control of OPRD at MRDPW (after 2009) Ministry of Regional Development</p>	

				and Public Works annual reporting	planning
OUTCOME 1: The methodologies, skills, knowledge, and information management system for mainstreaming global environmental considerations into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of regional development and spatial planning policies are in place	Indicator 3: At least 130 staff, are applying their training (developed by the project) in their review of plans, projects and programmes. (Mid-term target: Training programme fully developed and 20 people trained)	0	130	Project reports. Report from training institution Results from annual survey.	MRDPW and MOEW are willing to put in place institutional incentives to encourage staff to acquire and apply skills related to mainstreaming of GE in regional development planning Adequate access to necessary data can be effectively facilitated Cooperation and links can be established with other countries in the region and beyond to tap into
	Indicator 4: GE indicators identified and used in evaluating the implementation of RDPs (regional development plans) and MDPs (municipal development plans) and projects (Mid-term target:	GE indicators have not been identified	Identified GE indicators are used to verify “zero negative impact on the environment” of RDPs and MDPs and projects	Annual reporting on RDPs and MDPs implementation	

⁵ The indicators to be used by the projects under the OPRD is expected to be ready by mid 2008 as part of activities related to Indicator 4

	Information on GE indicators accessible, reporting process and reporting format pilot tested.)				existing experience and knowledge.
	Indicator 5: The established web-site for “GE integration into local and regional planning” is viewed and used as an useful information source in work related matters by municipal and regional planners, interested stakeholders and Government staff (MRDPW etc.) (Mid-term target: The established website is fully operational and its existence is recognized by municipal and regional planners, interested stakeholders and Government staff (MRDPW etc.)	Web-site for “GE integration into local and regional planning” not established	Web-site for “GE integration into local and regional planning” used as an information source	Project reports. Results from annual survey.	

<p>OUTCOME 2: Institutional changes that support mainstreaming of global environmental into regional development and spatial planning are in place.</p>	<p>Indicator 6: Staff participation (MRDPW, district administrations and municipalities) in (xx hours of) trainings, seminars and workshops related to “green” development planning and implementation through Ministry support (as well as from other funding sources). (Final target: Staff participation in (1000 hours) of trainings, seminars and workshops related to “green” development planning and implementation)</p>	0	6240 hours	Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting	<p>MRDPW views PMU and its functioning as an integral part of its operations.</p> <p>MRDPW staff can be vocal proponents of mainstreaming GE in their interaction with other Managing Authorities (through participation in Working Groups).</p>
	<p>Indicator 7: 100% of job descriptions and performance evaluation forms within the <u>relevant</u> departments and structures of Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works (app. 50) have been updated in accordance with the Methodological Guidance, so as to outline the specific task required, by the individual positions, to ensure overall integration of GE into</p>	0	100% of the relevant staff’s job descriptions have been updated (app. 50)	<p>External Review of relevant job descriptions</p> <p>Methodological Guidance adopted by MRDPW for update of relevant job descriptions</p>	

	the Ministry's activities. <i>(Final target: 25% of the relevant staff's job descriptions and performance evaluation forms have been updated.)</i>				
	Indicator 8: Number of meetings held by an inter-ministerial expert Task Force aimed at exchanging experience and best practices and developing a proposal for integrating GE concerns into the work of other ministries. <i>(Final target: 1 meetings held by the Task Force)</i>	0	At least 4 meetings held by the Task Force	Project reports. Minutes from Task Force meetings	
OUTCOME 3: Regional development plans and municipal-level spatial development plans are revised to integrate global environmental objectives in a pilot region through application of	Indicator 9: The new GE sensitive guidelines adopted by MRDPW, for regional ⁶ and municipality planning are introduced to a set of municipalities and the 28 district administrations. <i>(Mid-term target: Review of</i>	N/A	Adopted guidelines introduced to municipalities and regional administrations	Guidelines Project reports. Ministry of Regional Development and Public	Capacity development measures for mainstreaming GE include appropriate staff from the SE region.

⁶ National planning follows the cycle. National strategy -> Regional Strategy -> municipality planning according to the regional strategy -> regional planning combining the municipality planning wishes -> national planning following the planning wishes outlined in the regional plans.

capacities developed in Outcomes 1 and 2.	regional and municipal planning documentation underway.)			Works annual reporting	
	Indicator 10: Number of public hearings that is held for each of the development plan reviewed and an equal number of seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring held. (Final target: Materials for seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring produced)	0	At least 1 public hearing and 1 seminar per reviewed plan/strategy	Project reports.	

Appendix 5 -Financial Planning Cofinancing

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Actual</i>
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
<u>Totals</u>										

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

Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

List of Abbreviations

CD	Capacity Development
DDS	District Development Strategies
EU	European Union
ExAs	Executing Agencies
GE	Global Environment
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GRDP	Greening Regional Development Programmes
HQ	Head Quarters
IAs	Implementing Agencies
ISPA	Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDPs	Municipal Development Plans
MOEW	Ministry of Environment and Water
MOF	Ministry of Forestry
MRDPW	Ministry for Regional Development and Public Works
NCSA	National Capacity Self Assessment
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NPD	National Project Director
NOPRD	National Operational Program for Regional Development
NSFRD	National Strategy for Regional Development
OPs	Operational Programs
PAB	Project Advisory Board
PDF-A	Project Development Facility Block A
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PTA	Principal Technical Advisor of UNDP/GEF
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RDA	Regional Development Act
RDPs	Regional Development Plans
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SC	Steering Committee
SEAs	Strategic Environmental Assessments
TDA	Territorial Development Act
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change