Terms of Reference

 Climate Adaptation and Mitigation Program for Aral Sea Basin (CAMP4ASB)

**Individual International Consultant (Team Leader) for terminal evaluation of the CAMP4ASB project**

# 1. Evaluation Background

Under World Bank-GCF- CAREC M&E policies and procedures, all regular and large-sized projects supported by the World Bank should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

The Final Evaluation assesses the project's relevance, performance, and success. It looks at signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including contributing to capacity development and achieving global and national environmental goals. The Final Evaluation also identifies/documents lessons learned and makes recommendations that project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related projects and programs.

CAREC initiates this Final Evaluation following the rules and regulations of the World Bank for the **"Climate Adaptation and Mitigation Program for Aral Sea Basin"** program. It aims to provide managers (at the level of national coordination units (NCUs) in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan and WB/GCF) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

Many projects financed by the World Bank and the Green Environmental Fund under the International Development Association, considering the environmental and climate vertical funds, are designed to address the root causes of such zoonotic pandemics. The current crisis takes its root in a number of human-induced adverse impacts that are undermining the stability of critical ecosystems on which key economic sectors rest (e.g., deforestation, land use changes, expansion of agricultural land, climate change), all of which are compounded by the additional pressures of rising inequality amongst others. Thus, the project's support is, and will continue to be, focused on prevention so that this kind of situation does not happen again and countries can 'build back better.'

# 2. Project Background

 The CAMP4ASB project received financing from the World Bank as part of the International Development Association on November 3, 2015, and an allocation of US$38 million from the International Development Association (IDA) was approved to finance the first phase of the CAMP4ASB regional program. This approved financing includes US$9 million for Tajikistan, US$14 million for Uzbekistan, and US$15 million for regional activities implemented by the EC IFAS with support from CAREC for day-to-day regional coordination and implementation of the regional components of the project. Following that, the Bank and the GCF signed the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) #FP014, dated May 4, 2020, for US$19 million, effective June 2, 2020. The Bank then entered into Subsidiary Agreements with three Executing Entities: 1) the Republic of Tajikistan on June 25, 2021; 2) the Executive Committee of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea (EC-IFAS) on August 18, 2021; and 3) the Republic of Uzbekistan on September 24, 2021. The Bank declared the Subsidiary Agreements effective on January 14, 2023, with a closing date of May 31, 2024.

Scaling up the Climate Adaptation and Mitigation Program for the Aral Sea Basin (CAMP4ASB) by supporting adaptation activities in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Providing grants to the most vulnerable communities for climate resilient measures in priority areas, including the poorest populations residing in risk-prone areas and marginalized groups such as women.

The CAMP4ASB Program is a World Bank Group program addressing both adaptation and mitigation support in the Aral Sea Basin. The program builds regional cooperation to the challenges of climate change. GCF investments contributed to CAMP4ASB by addressing adaptation in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

GCF's engagement supports adopting climate-smart rural production and landscape management investments through a regional climate investment facility. It targets the poorest and most climate-vulnerable rural communities, benefiting farmers and villages.  The facility strengthens climate resilience and food security. Agricultural, land, and water management practices will be implemented based on local agroecological conditions to strengthen climate change resilience. Investments via the facility are demand-driven and include crop diversification, water resource management, rehabilitation of degraded land, conservation agriculture, livestock production improvements, agro-product processing, energy efficiency improvements, and expansion of renewable energy sources.

 **3. Objectives and Tasks of the Assignment**

The evaluation's objective is to assess the achievement of the project objective, the affecting factors, the broader project impact, the contribution to the general goal/strategy, and the project partnership strategy.

The international consultant is supported by a national consultant based in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. The consultant will facilitate the international consultant and provide necessary substantive and operational support in carrying out this evaluation.

Project success will be measured based on the Project Logical Framework (see Annex 1), which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will assess the aspects listed in the report outline attached in Annex 2.

The evaluation will focus on the following aspects:

* Project design and its relevance in relation to:
	1. *Development priorities* at the national level in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan;
	2. *Stakeholders –* assess if the specific needs were met;
	3. *Country ownership/drivenness* – participation and commitments of government, local authorities, public services, and residents;
	4. *CAREC and the World Bank missions to promote* integrated land management, environmental Protection and management;

* Performance - look at the progress that has been made by the project relative to the achievement of its objective and outcomes;
	1. *Effectiveness* - the extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and the desired outcomes, and the overall contribution of the project to national strategic objectives;
	2. *Efficiency* - assess efficiency against the overall impact of the project for better projection of achievements and benefits resulting from project resources, including an assessment of the different implementation modalities and the cost-effectiveness of the utilization of World Bank-GCF resources and actual co-financing for the achievement of project results;
	3. *Timeliness* of results.

* Management arrangements focused on project implementation:
	1. *General implementation and management* - evaluate the adequacy of the project implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the Regional and National Coordination units, the partnership strategy, and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to World Bank-GCF requirements and also from the perspective of "good (or bad) practice model" that could be used for replication / learning useful lessons.
	2. *Financial accountability* – the extent to which sound financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems, and adjustment of activities, budgets, and inputs.
	3. *Monitoring and evaluation on the project level* – assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation and its internalization by competent authorities and service providers after the completion of the project, focusing on the relevance of the performance indicators, that are:
		+ - Specific: The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving that objective.
			- Measurable: The monitoring system and indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what it covers and there are practical ways to measure it.
			- Achievable and Attributable: The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
			- Relevant and Realistic: The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved practically and reflect stakeholders' expectations.
			- Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted: The system allows progress to be tracked cost-effective at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of particular stakeholder groups to be impacted by the project.

* The overall success of the project with regard to the following criteria:
	1. *Impact* - assessment of results regarding the development objectives of the project and the achievement of sustainable land management in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Support is needed to change existing patterns of land use and improve land conditions by strengthening farm business management and the current land-use planning system, which are the primary financial and administrative drivers of land use, thus addressing land degradation problems in the long term,
	2. *Sustainability* - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project; *static sustainability* which refers to the continuous flow of the same benefits to the same target groups; *dynamic sustainability* use and/or adaptation of the projects' results by original target groups and/or other target groups. It should include a comparison of the baseline assessment with the terminal assessment and make some inferences as to what contribution(s) the project has made towards institutionalizing the capacities developed;
	3. *Contribution to capacity development* - the extent to which the project has empowered target groups and has made it possible for the government and local institutions to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects' results;
	4. *Replication* – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan and the region, outlining of possible funding sources; replication to date without direct intervention of the project;
	5. *Synergies* with other similar projects funded by the government or other donors.

Besides, the evaluation should also consider the below criteria for evaluations for TE:

 At minimum:

* + 1. Relevance
		2. Effectiveness
		3. Efficiency
		4. Gender equality
	1. Additional cross-cutting issues, as relevant: vulnerable groups, poverty, and environment nexus, climate change mitigation and adaptation)
	2. Progress to Impact
	3. M&E Design and Implementation
	4. CAREC regional oversight/implementation
	5. NCUs project execution
	6. Adaptive Management
	7. Stakeholder Engagement
	8. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

In addition to a descriptive assessment, criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory, with an explanation of the rating. Also, the Overall Rating of the project should be indicated.

Issues of special consideration:

The evaluation will review and assess changes in development conditions by addressing the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process considered during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of the World Bank, CAREC, and/or the Governments, highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

# 4. Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English. The Report of the Final Evaluation will be a standalone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report must provide complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings to the CARC and the World Bank. The report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements. The length of the final evaluation report shall not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

# 5. Evaluation Approach

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however, it should be made clear that the evaluation team may revise the approach as necessary in consultation with CAREC and the World Bank. Any changes should align with the best international criteria, professional norms, and standards. Any modifications to the proposed approach should be explicitly approved by CAREC/World Bank before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide an evidence-based approach using credible, reliable, and useful information. Project partners and stakeholders must easily understand it.

The evaluation should provide as much gender-disaggregated data as possible.

The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation through desk review and online consultations with stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach, ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, CAREC RCU, National Coordination Units, and key stakeholders.

The Evaluation Team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the World Bank - GCF – CAREC FAA agreement – including Annual Reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that may be considered useful for evidence-based assessment.

With support from the national consultant, the international consultant shall follow the interviews to collect data on the project's relevance, performance, and success. The evaluation team should make the utmost effort to collect all credible information and consult all relevant stakeholders (via key informant interviews, etc.) to ensure the evaluation's conduct and outcomes are not impacted.

The methodology to be used by the Evaluation Team should be presented in the report in full detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation reviewed;
* Interviews;
* Field visits;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

*Although the Evaluation Team should feel free to discuss all matters relevant to its assignment with the authorities, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of the World Bank, GCF, CAREC, or National Coordination Units.*

The Evaluation Team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the evaluation resources.

# 6. Deliverables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№**  | **Expected deliverables**  | **Estimated duration to complete** **(on workdays)**  | **Target due date**  | **Responsible**  | **Reviewers/ Approvers**  |
| 1.  | Desk review  | 3 workdays  | May 01, 2024  | CAMP4ASB Manager, Senior M&E Specialist  | CAREC Executive Director  |
| 2.  | Online RCU, NCUs, and WB TTL briefings for the evaluation team.  | 2 workdays  | May 07, 2024   |
| 3.  | Interviews with stakeholders, data collection, field visits to the project’s sites  | 15 workdays  | May 24, 2024  |
| 4.  | Presentation of preliminary findings at the Central Asian Climate Change Conference, Almaty, Kazakhstan. | 1 workday  | May 28, 2024 |
| 6.  | Validation of findings with stakeholders through circulation of the draft TE report for comments, meetings, and other types of feedback mechanisms  | 1 day | June 03, 2024 |  |
| 7.  | Submission of the draft Terminal Evaluation Report | 8 workdays  | June 14, 2021  |   |
| 8. | Submission of the Final Terminal Evaluation report and its acceptance by the World Bank and CAREC (incorporating comments received on the first draft)  | 5 workdays  | June 20, 2024  | CAMP4ASB Manager, Senior M&E Specialist  | CAREC Executive Director  |
|  | **Total effort:**  | **35 w/days**  |  |  |  |

# 7. Institutional arrangements

Payment for services will be made from the Project funds with satisfactory discharge of duties and achievement of results. The work results shall be approved by the CAREC Executive Director in coordination with the World Bank TTL manager through the CAMP4ASB program manager and Senior M&E Specialist.

* The consultant will work under the direct supervision of the CAMP4ASB program manager and the overall guidance of the Senior M&E Specialist;
* The consultant is responsible for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables;
* The consultant ensures timely and rational planning, implementation of activities, and achievement of results following the Terms of Reference;
* The consultant provides the results of work by Deliverables;
* The consultant shall provide reports in electronic form in MS Word format in English.

Prior to approval of the final report, the CAMP4ASB program manager, in close coordination with the Senior M&E specialist and NCUs in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, will circulate the draft for comments to government counterparts: Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of Republic of Tajikistan, Regional Coordination Unit ad World Bank TTL. CAREC, through its RCU and NCUs, and the stakeholders, will submit comments and suggestions within 10 working days after receiving the draft. The finalized Terminal Evaluation Report, addressing all comments received, shall be submitted by May 10, 2024.

If any discrepancies have emerged 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.

# 8. Duration of assignment

The consultant is expected to devote a maximum of 35 working days over a period of 2 calendar months from May 01 - June 20, 2024. The assignment commences immediately after signing the contract.

**9. Duty Station**

Home-based, with one travel to Kazakhstan, Almaty, Tajikistan, Dushanbe and project sites, and Uzbekistan, Tashkent and project sites.

# 10. Qualification requirements

* A Master's degree (PhD preferred) in natural resources management, economics, environmental studies or other closely related field;
* 7 years of working experience in Environmental Economics, Agriculture, Sustainable Land Management, Organic Farming, and financial incentives; experience in gender-sensitive evaluation and analysis;
* At least 5 years of experience in working with World Bank/UNDP/GCF evaluations;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to land desertification protection;
* Recent knowledge of the GCF and World Bank Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* Recent knowledge of World Bank/GCF's results-based management policies and procedures;
* Recognized expertise in the Agricultural extension and sustainable land management and stakeholder involvement fields;
* Familiarity with the agricultural sector, extension, legislation, policies, and management structures in CIS would be an asset;
* Fluent in English, both written and spoken;
* Computer literacy.

# 11. Competencies

* Excellent analytical skills and ability to write in a concise and comprehensible manner;
* Ability to work with tight deadlines and prepare accurate and clear reports for policymakers at short notice;
* Ability to interact with high-level government officials; also, be able to work closely with technical experts on a day-to-day basis, as well as to provide hands-on technical assistance and knowledge transfer.

# 12. Scope of price proposal

This is a lump sum contract, paid upon completion and certification of deliverables. The interested candidate must submit his/her financial proposal in USD in a separate file (from other required documents to be submitted). The financial proposal should include all the expert's expenses, including daily fees, travel expenses, and any other relevant expenses for the assignment. Payment will be made in tranches after the approval of the report, based on the above results and the signing of the Certificate of payment for the result by the CAMP4ASB program manager and Executive Director.

# 13. Recommended Presentation of Offer

The following documents in PDF are to be attached to the Offer:

1. A duly drafted Offeror's letter confirming interest and readiness for the assignment; Financial proposal, including the fixed total contract value, with a breakdown of costs following the CAREC template;
2. Detailed CV, where previous work experience in similar projects should be included, as well as contact details (email and phone number) of the Offeror;
3. Other documents certifying the work experience, expertise, and skills (qualification improvement certificates\diplomas, awards, etc.)

# Annex 1. Project Results Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **2.3 PROJECT OUTPUTS IMPLEMENTATION STATUS[[1]](#footnote-1)**  |
| **Project Output** | **Project Activity** | **Status[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Implementation progress[[3]](#footnote-3) (%)** |
| ***Component 1******Regional Climate Knowledge Services***  | ***Sub-component 1.1: Climate Investment Assessment Mechanism******(Activities to support a mechanism to assess the results and lessons of climate investments implemented******under sub-component 2.1)*** | *Activity Started -progress on track* |  |
|  |  |
| ***Sub-component 1.2: Outreach and Coalition Building******(Outreach, capacity building, development of knowledge products, communications, and public engagement strategy)*** | *Activity Started -progress on track* |  |
|  |  |
| ***Component 2******Regional Climate Investment Facility***  | ***Sub-Component 2.1: Investment Financing******Investments (sub-loans) in Tajikistan to support suitable practices and technologies to improve climate resilience, risk reduction, and mitigation******Investments (sub-grants) in Uzbekistan to support suitable practices and technologies to enhance climate resilience, risk reduction and mitigation*** | *Activity Started -progress on track* |  |
|  |  |
|  | Sub-component 2.2: Capacity Building and Community Support |  |
| ***Component 3******Regional and National Coordination***  | ***Sub-component 3.1 Regional Coordination and 3.2 National Coordination*** | *Activity Started - progress on track* | *100%*  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **2.4 PROGRESS UPDATE ON THE LOGIC FRAMEWORK INDICATORS[[4]](#footnote-4) \*\*\*** |
| **2.4.1 PROGRESS UPDATE ON FUND-LEVEL IMPACT INDICATORS OF THE LOGIC FRAMEWORK** |
| ***`*** | *Baseline* | *Current value[[5]](#footnote-5)* | *Target**(mid-term)* | *Target**(final)* | *Remarks*  *(including changes[[6]](#footnote-6), if any)* |
| ***Total number of direct******and indirect******beneficiaries*** | *49,431 (of which 26,635 female); of which 32,954 (direct) and 16,477 (indirect) beneficiaries* |  | *123,000 (of which**49, 000 female), of**which 63,000**(Direct) and**60,000 (indirect)* | *205,000 (of which**52,000 female), of**which 90,000**(direct), 115,000**(indirect)* |  |
| ***Number of beneficiaries******relative to total******population*** | *0,6% (total)**0,4% (direct)**0,2% (indirect)* |  | *1.5% (total)**0.8% (direct)**0.7% (indirect)* | *2.5% (total)**1.1% (direct)**1.4% (indirect)* |  |
| ***A1.1 Change in expected******losses of lives and******economic assets (USD) due to the impact of extreme climate-related******disasters in the******the geographic area of the******GCF intervention.*** | *0* |  | *$ 14 millon* | *$ 18 millon* |  |
| ***A1.2 number of males******and females benefitting******from the adoption of******diversified, climate-resilient******livelihood******options (including******fisheries, agriculture,******tourism)*** | *0*  |  | *74,000 male**49,000 female* | *123,000 male**82,000 female* |  |
| ***A4.1 Coverage/scale of******ecosystems protected******and strengthened in******response to climate******variability and change*** | *0* |  | *17,000 ha* | *35,000 ha* |  |
| **2.4.2 PROGRESS UPDATE ON PROJECT/PROGRAMME LEVEL INDICATORS OF THE LOGIC FRAMEWORK***[[7]](#footnote-7)* |
| ***Project/Programme indicators******(Mitigation/Adaptation)***  | *Baseline* | *Current value[[8]](#footnote-8)*  | *Target**(mid-term)* | *Target**(final)* | *Remarks*  *(including changes[[9]](#footnote-9), if any)* |
| ***A5.1: Institutional and******regulatory systems that******improve incentives for******climate resilience and******their effective******implementation*** | *0* |  | *1 mechanism is in**place and**functioning* | *3 mechanisms are**in place and**functioning* |  |
| ***A6.2: Use of climate******information******products/services in******decision-making in******climate-sensitive sectors*** | *0* |  | *Integrated**regional analytical**platform**developed* | *Unified,**integrated**regional**analytical**a platform for climate-resilient**and low**emissions**development fully**operational* |  |
| ***A8.1: Number of males******and females made aware******of climate threats and******related appropriate******responses*** | *0 male**0 female* |  | *74,000 male**49,000 female* | *123,000 male**82,000 female* |  |
| ***Improved understanding of climate-smart technologies and practices (sub-component 1.1)*** |
| ***Number of******project-financed climate******investments assessed*** | *0* |  | *40* | *114* |  |
| ***Improvement of the******the average quality of the******assessed Sub-Projects as******a result of feedback******from the previous project******reviews and feedback*** | *33%* |  | *Community-level**participatory**appraisals and**community action**plans in place and**operational* | *Appropriate**investment plans**incorporating**in-depth**evaluation in place and**operational* |  |
| ***Number of******multi-country climate******coordination networks******supported under******project, enabling******intra-governmental,******sectoral, Nongovernmental******Organizations (NGO),******etc. cooperation.*** | *0* |  | *2* |  5 |  |
| ***Number of policies and******regulations initiated by******the coordination******networks that have been******adopted and******implemented in******participating Central******Asia countries*** | *0* |  | *2* | *4* |  |
| ***Climate-smart******technologies and******practices piloted******(sub-component 2.1)*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Number of climate******investments financed******and effectively******implemented under the******project*** | *0* |  | *114* | *190* |  |
| ***Number of beneficiaries******of facilitation package******that have successfully******applied the newly******acquired skills and******knowledge*** | *0* |  | *25,000* | *50,000* |  |

# Annex 2. Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

Executive summary

* Brief description of the project
* Context and Purpose of the Evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned

Introduction

* Purpose of the Evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* Methodology of the Evaluation
* Structure of the Evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

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

Findings and Conclusions

 Project formulation

* + Implementation approach
	+ Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
	+ Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
	+ Country ownership/Driveness
	+ Replication approach
	+ Cost-effectiveness
	+ World Bank and CAREC comparative advantage
	+ Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
	+ Management arrangements

 Implementation

* + Implementation approach
	+ The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
	+ Effective partnership arrangements established for the implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
	+ Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
	+ Financial Planning
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Management by the CAREC RCU and NUCs in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan
* Coordination and operational issues

 Results

* Attainment of objectives
* Sustainability
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations

* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned

* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success

Annexes

* TE TOR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* TE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
* Ratings Scales
* TE mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
* Signed TE final report clearance form
* Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft TE report

Annex 2b. Explanation of Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

The implementation approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of a practical implementation approach may include:

* The logical framework used during implementation as a management
* Effective partnership arrangements established for the implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the project's relevance to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. The Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans.

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

* The Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
* Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
* Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental officials, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
* The recipient government has maintained a financial commitment to the project
* The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives
* The project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement comprises three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the World Bank-GCF -financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

* Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

* Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences, and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

* Project institutional networks are well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision-making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure.
* Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
* Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after World Bank-GCF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

* Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
* Establish the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits (from the public and private sectors, income-generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives) once the World Bank-GCF assistance ends.
* Development of suitable organizational arrangements by the public and/or private sector.
* Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
* Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
* Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).
* Identification and involvement of champions (i.e., individuals in government and civil society who can promote the sustainability of project outcomes).
* Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
* Achieving stakeholder consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

In the context of World Bank – GCF projects, the replication approach is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects: replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic areas) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

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

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The major findings should be presented in the TE if a financial audit has been conducted.

Effective financial plans include:

* Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing.
* Strong financial controls, including reporting and planning, allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allow for a proper and timely flow of funds, and allow for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.

*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, NGOs, 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.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

* The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of development objectives according to schedule and as cost-effectively as initially planned.
* The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the cost levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions, and outputs are proceeding according to plan so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities, and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and evaluation include activities to measure the project's achievements, such as identifying performance indicators, measuring procedures, and determining baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation.

# Annex 4. Rate tables

Table 1: Status of objective/outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OBJECTIVE  | MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM THE PROJECT LOG FRAME  | END-OF-PROJECT TARGET  | STATUS DELIVERY\*  | OF |  RATING\*\*  |
| Objective :   |   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
| OUTCOMES  |   | END-OF-PROJECT TARGET  | STATUS DELIVERY  | OF |  RATING  |
| Outcome 1:  |   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
| Outcome 2:   |   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
| Outcome 3:  |   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
| Outcome 4:  |   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
| Outcome 5:  |   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |
|   |   |   |  |   |

*\* Status of delivery coloring codes:*

The green / completed – indicator shows the achievement

The yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red – Indicator shows poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by the end of the project

\*\* Rating:

Highly Satisfactory = HS

Satisfactory = S

Marginally Satisfactory = MS

Unsatisfactory = U

Table 2: Project ratings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE  | RATING SCALE  |  |  |  | RATING  |
|   | HU  | U  | MU  | MS  | S  | HS  |   |
| PROJECT FORMULATION  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Conceptualization/Design  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Stakeholder participation  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Implementation Approach  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The use of the logical framework  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Adaptive management  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Use/establishment of information technologies  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Operational relationships between the institutions involved  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Technical capacities  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Monitoring and Evaluation  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Stakeholder participation  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Production and dissemination of information  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Local resource users and NGOs' participation  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Establishment of partnerships  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Involvement and support of governmental institutions  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| PROJECT RESULTS  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Achievement of objective  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 1  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 2  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 3  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 4  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 5  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 6  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Outcome 7  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

# Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluation Team

The following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Document  | Description  |
| Project document  | Project Document  |
| Project reports  | FAAWorld Bank CAMP4ASB Project Document World Bank Environmental and Social Screening results Annual progress reports and work plans of the RCUs and NCUs AWP's Consultant's reports and publications SC meeting minutes  |

# Annex 6. Cost breakdown template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Units\*  | Rate / USD  | Total / USD  |
| Work in home office.  |   |   |   |
| Desk review  |   |   |   |
| Briefings by CAREC. RCU and NCUs  |   |   |   |
| Drafting of the evaluation report  |   |   |   |
| Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings, and other types of feedback mechanisms  |   |   |   |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on the first draft)  |   |   |   |
| Work on mission  |   |   |   |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings  |   |   |   |
| Sub-total fee  |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
| Travel costs  |   |   |   |
| International travel to and from Kazakhstan  |   |   |   |
| Local travel (to be arranged and covered by the project)  | n/a  | n/a  | n/a  |
| DSA (overnights)  |   |   |   |
| Sub-total travel costs  |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
| TOTAL  |   |   |   |

\* Estimates are indicated in the TOR. The applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

1. Outputs and Activities reported here should be aligned with the Activities in the Logic Framework and Implementation Timetable of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Activity Not Yet Due; Activity Started -ahead of schedule; Activity started – progress on track; Activity started but progress delayed; Activity start is delayed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Implementation progress on a cumulative basis as of the date of the report.

. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Per the approved methodology in and the Logic Framework in the Funding Proposal, please provide an update on the relevant indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. As of 31 December of the relevant year. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Related to the approved indicators and targets in the Logic Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As per the relevant indicators established in the Funding Proposal and the Performance Measurement Framework, including relevant updates agreed with GCF, if applicable. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. As of 31 December of the relevant calendar year. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Related to the approved indicators and targets in the Logic Framework or relevant FAA.

. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)