

Terms of Reference

for

Mid Term Evaluation of the Project
(National Consultant Search)

**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

Bulgaria is on the threshold of EU accession and is aligning its sustainable development policies with EU requirements. The goal of EU accession by 2007 offers some important opportunities for explicitly incorporating the mandates of the UNCBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD into the regional development and spatial planning processes, which are typically focused on socio-economic issues. Bulgaria is embarking on a different, systematic regional development planning approach. The responsibility for determining the regional development path lies with the Ministry for Regional Development and Public Works (MRDPW), and this development path will be articulated through a series of documents - National Regional Development Strategy, the National Operational Programme for Regional Development (NOPRD), six Regional Development Plans (RDPs), 28 District Development Strategies (DDSs) and 264 Municipal Development Plans (MDPs). It is this evolving regional development planning process that the proposed GEF project is seeking to link in to at an early, upstream stage, so as to ensure that global environmental concerns can be mainstreamed.

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.

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

II.1. Introduction

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has two overarching objectives:

- To promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. GEF results will be monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits; and
- To promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects and to improve knowledge and performance.

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>) and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>).

This Evaluation is to explore five major criteria:

- (i) Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- (ii) Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- (iii) Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- (iv) Results – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
- (v) Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

II.2. Evaluation audience

This Mid Term Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Bulgaria as the Implementation Agency for the Rio Conventions project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Administration, UNDP Bulgaria Country Office and UNDP/GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's outcomes

and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

II.3. Evaluation objectives and scope

The objective of this Mid Term Evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective so far, and to produce possible recommendations on how to improve the management of the project until its completion in end of June 2010.

The evaluation report will play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on:

- how to strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project;
- how to ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective;
- how to enhance organizational and development learning;
- how to enable informed decision – making.

The report will have to provide to the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The consultant should prepare specific ratings on eight aspects of the project, as described in the 'Reporting' section of this Terms of Reference. Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all objectives in the established timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding.

The evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

The evaluators will assess the project concept and design. They should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the outcomes and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

Replication approach

The evaluation will assess whether the lessons and experiences set to come out of the project are replicable or can be scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. The evaluation will also assess the project's knowledge transfer mechanism including its capacity building and training provided to individuals, and institutions.

The Mid-term Evaluation will also cover the following aspects:

1. Progress towards Results

Changes in development conditions. Address the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

- Have issues under the Rio Conventions been adequately addressed at regional and municipality level?
- Have there been improvements in stakeholder skills and knowledge to apply mainstreaming methods and tools in the regional development and spatial planning?
- Have there been institutional changes that resulted in more effective planning in regard to land degradation, energy efficiency CO2 emissions, biodiversity conservation etc. and have that contributed to an improvement compared to the baseline situation? If not, why not?
- Is there distinct improvement in the information turnover and use in decision making regarding the integration of Rio Conventions concerns into the regional development and spatial planning processes among project stakeholders?
- Has public participation in local and regional planning increased as a result of the project?

Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the project site to conditions in similar unmanaged sites.

Project strategy: how and why outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

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, or support to, financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the local economy/planning, etc.

2. Project's Adaptive Management Framework

(a) Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
 - Do they provide the necessary information?
 - Do they involve key partners?
 - Are they efficient?
 - Are additional tools required?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary¹. (Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise²);
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements³. Apply SMART indicators as necessary;
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tool including the new UNDP/GEF' capacity development indicator framework for the CB2 projects and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.

(b) Risk Management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIR are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted;
- Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
 - Is the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System⁴ appropriately applied?
 - How can the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?
 - Evaluate whether the risks, their management strategies and assumptions are still valid

¹ See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

² See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

³ See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

⁴ UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XII at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

(c) Work Planning

- Assess the use of the logical framework (Appendix A) as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
 - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content
- Assess the use of routinely updated work-plans;
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- Are work planning processes result-based⁵? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions, as well as *co-financing* delivery (Appendix D). Any irregularities must be noted.

(d) Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3. Underlying Factors

- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors;
- Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made;
- Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

4. UNDP Contribution

- Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
 - Field visits
 - Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
 - PIR preparation and follow-up
 - GEF guidance
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide⁶, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework;

⁵ RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

⁶ The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>

- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance to the project management.

5. Partnership Strategy

- Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:
 - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
 - Using already existing data and statistics
 - Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
- Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
- Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making; Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
- Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

6. Country Ownership/Driveness

- Asses the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas,
- Assess whether relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project implementation and/or oversight
- Asses the project’s collaboration with regional and municipal administrations

II.1. Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that 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
 - The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation
- The Project and its development context
 - Project start and its duration

- Implementation status
 - Problems that the project seek to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
- An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
 - An analysis of how recommendations from initial project evaluation have been addressed;
 - Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance)
 - Project formulation
 - Implementation approach
 - Country ownership/Drivenness
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
 - Implementation
 - Financial planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Management by the UNDP country office
 - Coordination and operation issues
 - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
 - Results
 - Attainment of objective
 - Prospects of sustainability
 - Conclusions and recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
 - Lessons learned
 - Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.
 - Annexes: TOR, itinerary, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

The length of the mid-term evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

III. Evaluation team – qualities and requirements

A team of independent experts 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 Team Leader** and **one Additional (National) Consultant**. The consultants 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 SEA, regional development and spatial planning policies in Bulgaria is an asset;
- (ix) Demonstrable analytical skills;
- (x) Work experience in relevant areas (environmental management and planning, SEA, regional development and spatial planning) 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.

Specifically, the **Additional (National) Consultant** will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the Team Leader with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the Additional 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 the Team Leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications for that position only.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles⁷:

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

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore, applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the Rio Conventions Project's policy-making process and/or delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Project Administration, the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works, UNDP Bulgaria or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

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.

If individual evaluators are selected, UNDP will appoint one Team Leader. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

⁷ See p.16 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

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 Group⁸). 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 the Appendix B to this Terms of Reference;
- Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP Bulgaria, Rio Conventions Project Administration (Project Management Unit and Regional Support Centers), Project Steering Committee members, National Project Director;
- Field visits (Appendix C);
- 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 |

⁸ See <http://www.uneval.org/>

| | |
|----|---------------------------|
| MS | Marginally Satisfactory |
| MU | Marginally Unsatisfactory |
| U | Unsatisfactory |
| HU | Highly Unsatisfactory |
| NA | Not applicable |

IV. Implementation 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 Administration will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Timeframe for submission of the final report: 7 weeks upon start of the assignment 20 October. The evaluation should be completed by **8 December 2008**. 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 CO 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 | 4 days by the Team Leader and Additional Consultant |
| Briefings for evaluators | 1/2 day by the Rio Conventions Project Administration/ UNDP |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings | 5 days by the Team Leader and Additional Consultant |
| Preparation of first draft report | 5 days by the Team Leader and Additional Consultant |
| Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms | 14 days Bulgarian stakeholders |
| Incorporation of comments from Bulgarian stakeholders | 3 days by the Team Leader and Additional Consultant |
| Review and preparation of comments of second draft | 14 days Rio Conventions Project, UNDP, Government Counterparts and UNDP/GEF Bratislava |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | 3 days by the Team Leader and Additional Consultant |

Working Days:

Team Leader – 20 working days

Additional (National) Consultant – 20 working days

The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Bulgaria are 3rd to 7th November 2008. The assignment is to commence no later than 20 October, 2008.

APPLICATION: Please send your application, for the announced position of a **National Consultant**, containing the following information: a recent CV in UNDP format (P11 Form), a Letter of Interest, a brief outline of the approach and methodology to be used for the evaluation (max 3 pages), period of availability and daily rate in USD (excluding travel and DSA expenses, which shall be negotiated according to UNDP rules and procedures, if such travel is involved) to: Natalia Dimitrova, Rio Conventions Project Manager, Rio Conventions Project, 17-19 St.st. Kiril and Metodii Str. floor 6, room 601 A, Sofia 1202, BULGARIA, e-mail natalia@rioconventions.org, with a copy to Pavel Gospodinov, UNDP Programme Analyst on e-mail pavel.gospodinov@undp.org.

Deadline for applications is **10 September, 2008**.

Appendix 1 – 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 | Baseline | Target | Sources of verification | Assumptions and Risks |
| 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. | Indicator 1: New GE sensitive guidelines, for national, regional and municipality planning are adopted by the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works. (Mid term target: N/A) | GE sensitive guidelines are not in place | Guidelines adopted by mid 2009 | MRDPW adopts Methodological Guidelines in accordance with art. 20 (8) from RDA Project reports. | 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 planning |
| | 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. (Mid term target ⁹ : N/A) | 0 | 80% of projects under the OPRD funded after 2008 contain GE indicators relevant to the individual projects, as well as report on them | Information System for Monitoring and Control of OPRD at MRDPW (after 2009) Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting | |
| OUTCOME 1: The methodologies, skills, knowledge, and information management system for mainstreaming global environmental considerations into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of regional | 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 |

⁹ 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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| development and spatial planning policies are in place | | | | | 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 existing experience and knowledge. |
| | 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: Information on GE indicators accessible, reporting process and reporting format pilot tested.) | 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 | |
| | 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). (Mid term 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 the Ministry’s activities. (Mid term target: 25% of the relevant staff’s job descriptions and performance evaluation forms have been updated.)</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> | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|--|--|--|
| | <p>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. (Mid term target: 1 meetings held by the Task Force)</p> | 0 | At least 4 meetings held by the Task Force | Project reports. Minutes from Task Force meetings | |
| <p>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 capacities developed in Outcomes 1 and 2.</p> | <p>Indicator 9: The new GE sensitive guidelines adopted by MRDPW, for regional¹⁰ and municipality planning are introduced to a set of municipalities and the 28 district administrations. (Mid-term target: Review of regional and municipal planning documentation underway.)</p> | N/A | Adopted guidelines introduced to municipalities and regional administrations | Guidelines Project reports. Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works annual reporting | Capacity development measures for mainstreaming GE include appropriate staff from the SE region. |
| | <p>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. (Mid term target: Materials for seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring produced)</p> | 0 | At least 1 public hearing and 1 seminar per reviewed plan/strategy | Project reports. | |

¹⁰ 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.

Appendix B - 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
Revised Log-Frame document
UNDP Annual Reports (2007)
Project Implementation Reviews (2007 and 2008)
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

Appendix C - Proposed field mission schedule

3 – 7 November, 2008

3 Nov /Mon/ - meeting with project staff and project collaborators at UNDP

4 Nov /Tues/ - meeting with project SC members from MRDPW and MoEW

5 Nov /Wed/ - meeting with project collaborators from academic institutions, NGOs and consultants

6 Nov /Thurs/ – additional interviews, if requested and wrapping up of collected information

7 Nov /Fri/ - debriefing of project staff

Appendix D -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 |
| MEER | Ministry of Energy and Energy Resources |
| 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 |