

**Mid-Term Review**

**UNDP/GEF**

**Enabling Transboundary Co-operation and Integrated Water  
Resources Management in the Chu and Talas River Basins**

**Kyrgyz Republic and Republic of Kazakhstan**

**UNDP PIMS: 5176, Atlas Project ID: 00091092**

**Dr Peter Whalley June 2017**

## Project information

The work of this projects is financed from the GEF International Waters focal area through grant 5310. The project responds to objective 3 of the GEF 5 International Waters strategy to: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem based management of trans-boundary water systems.

### **Acknowledgements**

This independent mid-term review has been prepared by Dr Peter Whalley. The views expressed and comments made are his own. He would like to thank all those that have participated in the review process including the stakeholders in Taraz and Astana (Kazakhstan), and in Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), and the respective national UNDP Country Office teams. He is particularly grateful to the Regional Co-ordinator and members of the UNDP Project Management Unit who facilitated the travel and freely answered questions. He is particularly grateful for the assistance of Mrs. Gulsara Ilyasova who acted as translator for the mission.

## Contents

Project information.....	i
Contents.....	ii
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iv
Executive Summary.....	v
1 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Purpose of the MTR and objectives.....	1
1.2 Scope and methodology .....	1
1.2.1 Evaluation design, execution and analysis.....	1
1.2.2 Structure of the MTR report .....	2
1.2.3 Limitations of the evaluation .....	2
2 Project Description and Background Context.....	3
2.1 Development context .....	3
2.2 Problems that the project sought to address .....	3
2.3 Project description and strategy.....	4
2.4 Project budget.....	5
2.5 Project implementation arrangements .....	5
2.6 Project timing and milestones .....	6
2.7 Main stakeholders.....	6
3 Findings .....	7
3.1 Project strategy.....	7
3.1.1 Project design.....	7
3.1.2 Results framework .....	8
3.2 Progress towards results.....	9
3.3 Assessment of the GEF IW Tracking Tool.....	9
3.3.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis.....	9
3.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.....	13
3.4 Project implementation and adaptive management.....	13
3.4.1 Management arrangements .....	13
3.4.2 Work planning.....	14
3.4.3 Finance and co-finance .....	14
3.4.4 Project-level monitoring and evaluation system .....	16
3.4.5 Stakeholder engagement.....	16
3.4.6 Reporting.....	17
3.4.7 Communications .....	17

3.5	Sustainability.....	17
3.5.1	Financial risks to sustainability.....	17
3.5.2	Socio-economic risks to sustainability .....	18
3.5.3	Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability.....	18
3.5.4	Environmental risks to sustainability .....	19
4	Conclusions and Recommendations .....	20
4.1	Conclusions .....	20
4.2	Recommendations .....	21
	ANNEXES .....	24
	Annex 1 – Consultant’s Terms of Reference.....	25
	Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix.....	33
	Annex 3 - Stakeholder interview guide.....	37
	Annex 4 - MTR Ratings .....	38
	Annex 5 - Mission Agenda.....	40
	Annex 6 - Stakeholders involved in MTR .....	43
	Annex 7: Documents Reviewed .....	44
	Annex 8: MTR’s assessment of progress on Outcomes/Outputs .....	45
	Annex 9: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation /Mid-term Review Consultants.....	53

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

AWP	UNDP's Annual Work Plan
CEO	(GEF) Chief Executive Officer
CO	Country Office (UNDP)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTWC	Chu – Talas Water Commission
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality (UNDP project execution)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IMC	Inter-ministerial Co-ordination
IRH	UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub
ISO	International Standards Organisation
IW	GEF International Waters
IW:LEARN	GEF IW:LEARN project
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid-term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPD	National Policy Dialogues
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PB	Project Board
PIR	(GEF) Project Implementation Review
PMU	UNDP CO's Project Management Unit
RPC	Regional Project Co-ordinator
RTA	UNDP Regional Technical Advisor
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
SDC	Swiss Development Co-operation
SMART	Targets: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-bound
SWP	Shared Waters Partnership
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
ToR	Terms of Reference
TT	(GEF) Tracking Tool
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
USD	United States Dollar
WG	Working Group of the CTWC

## Executive Summary

### Project Summary Data

Project Title:	Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins		
GEF Project ID	5310		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID	5167	GEF financing:	1.000
Country	Kyrgyz Republic Republic of Kazakhstan	IA/EA own:	0.300
Region	Europe and CIS	Government: Kazakhstan: Kyrgyzstan:	0.750 1.170
Focal Area	International Waters	Other: SDC Finnish Government UNECE	0.654 1.314 2.200
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	IW Objective 3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem based management of trans-boundary water system	Total co-financing:	<b>6.239</b>
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Costs	<b>7.239</b>
Other Partners involved:	Governments of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan Government of Finland Swiss Development Co-operation UNECE Shared Water Partnership	ProDoc Signature (date project began)	May 2015
		Proposed end date:	June 2018

A mid-Term Review of the UNDP-GEF project ‘Enabling Transboundary Co-operation and Integrated Water Resources Management in the Chu and Talas River Basins’ has been undertaken, consistent with the expectations of the GEF and UNDP. The purpose of review is to enable the Governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, and UNDP to assess the progress and to take any necessary decisions on the remaining activities before project completion, to ensure that the project’s objectives are achieved.

The project responds to the threats posed by increasing water consumption and pollution to meet growing social, industrial and agricultural needs, compounded by climatic variability and change. Pressure on scarce water resources and aquatic ecosystems has been growing in recent years across the basins generating risks of conflicts between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan over water allocation. The project strengthens coordination and expand the role of transboundary institutions in balancing water uses, improving water quality and conservation of aquatic ecosystems, through strengthen

monitoring capacity and technologies. It contributes towards the joint management of the water resources of the Chu and Talas river basins.

The project responds to the regional problems affecting water and ecosystem management through the application of the GEF Transboundary Boundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) leading to the development of a regional Strategic Action Plan (SAP).

All stakeholders considered that the project's objective and outcomes will be achieved without a prolongation of the project, with technical approval by the Chu – Talas Water Commission (CTWC) of the SAP and the agreement on monitoring and data exchange. The project is implemented through three components: TDA, SAP and capacity development

The project has completed the TDA (approved by CTWC) but the document is still to be finalised for publication. The project has supported joint monitoring programmes at transboundary location and the sampling/analysis taken at multiple sites throughout the basin on a quarterly basis.

Significant work on the SAP has only recently commenced (at the time of the mid-term review). As is often experienced with GEF IW TDA/SAP projects, more time is spent on the TDA than planned. To-date, national meetings have been held to identify potential visions for the SAP followed by a regional meeting to agree a common vision and goals.

The third component is aimed at strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins to support the TDA/SAP development process and to provide capacity for the longer-term (post-project) monitoring of the Chu – Talas basin to aid the sustainability of the project's actions.

**Table 1 MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary for UNDP-GEF Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins**

Measure	MTR Rating* (expected by <i>end-of-project</i> )	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	The key indicators are linked to the final products but the MTR and stakeholders consider that the main products (SAP and monitoring agreements) will be <i>technically</i> approved. (Political approval is likely to take longer than the duration of the project)
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Component** 1 Achievement Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>	The TDA has been prepared and accepted by the Chu – Talas Commission and within relevant ministries of both governments.
	Component 2 Achievement Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>	The work of the SAP has just started with the joint agreement of the vision. Ministerial representatives from both countries (and the UNDP project team) are anticipating that the SAP will be delivered and <i>technically</i> approved by the Commission before the end of the project.
	Component 3 Achievement Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>	Training provided has been highly beneficial to the development of the TDA and is expected to contribute to the SAP delivery. In particular the on-going association with the Sava Commission is beneficial.
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The DIM approach through UNDP CO's Project Management Unit has been effective, efficient and provided some excellent added-value through close co-operation with the gender team and M&E reporting.
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Moderately Likely – Moderately Unlikely</b>	The project's financial sustainability is considered to be ' <b>Moderately Unlikely</b> ' especially in Kyrgyzstan, however the other dimensions of sustainability are considered to be ' <b>Moderately Likely</b> '

\*MTR Ratings are summarised in Annex 4

\*\* Components are used as an 'integration' of the 11 Outcomes

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are considered by the MTR consultant as being significant.

1. The project is closely aligned with the priorities of the countries to strengthen cross-border co-operation on IWRM. National stakeholders consider that the main outputs achieved for the project are of considerable value to the governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. Ministry stakeholders consider the project to be well managed and executed and is expected to reach key objectives as planned.
2. The project has been designed with too many outcomes that are similar which both adds to the complexity of project reporting and confuses the true outcomes to be delivered.

3. The execution arrangements are considered by the MTR consultant as effective and efficient. The approach offers significant advantages for relatively small projects, enabling shared resource expertise (e.g. gender, QA, procurement, finance, etc.) to be utilised by the project.
4. The Project Results Framework is overly ambitious with outputs expecting ministerial endorsement (e.g. the SAP). Political approval as an outcome, not as an output (as presented in the results framework), is more realistic.
5. The project has benefited from the previous (and ongoing) work of UNECE in assisting with a strong baseline of work and facilitating core actions associated with climate change scenarios.
6. The TDA has been a key output and an opportunity to strengthen capacity in both countries. The results of the TDA have been accepted by both governments through the Co-chairs of the Chu-Talas Water Commission. The co-operation between national experts has also been a route to improve the sustainability of the bilateral co-operation.
7. Although the main activities are just beginning on the SAP, the preparatory mission to the Sava Commission in 2016 and the expected further collaboration and co-operation with the Sava Commission to assist with the strengthening of the CTWC is considered by all as highly beneficial.
8. While adequate project briefings are provided during the Project Board Meetings and through the Chu-Talas Water Commission meetings, there were signs that some senior ministerial stakeholders would benefit from more frequent and clearer information on key topics, including the SAP, for example.
9. The lack of a current project website is inhibiting effective dissemination of results or raising awareness.
10. There has been little direct engagement with civil society including communities or the private sector.
11. UNDP's gender team has been proactive in enhancing actions within the project's activities resulting in an increase in the 'gender marker' classification of the project.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to the project team (regional co-ordinator and PMU)

**Table 2: MTR Recommendations**

	Issue	Recommendation
1	Project Results Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure results framework clearly represents the agreed activities (for example, delete the references to groundwater issues);</li> <li>• To add more specific metrics where possible (for example, numbers of persons attending meetings, disaggregated by sex, etc.)</li> </ul>
2	Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that the project website is operational (in Russian and English) as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Links should be made from the website to previous GEF Small Grants Projects that have undertaken related work in the region</li> <li>• The project should provide clear information about the SAP, SAP implementation, linkages with National Action Plans as briefings to senior ministerial representatives to facilitate the launch of the SAP</li> <li>• The project should provide more comprehensive reports on the Project Board Meetings to present a more complete picture of the steps in the discussions and decisions</li> </ul>
3	Strategic Action Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team should clarify the national mechanisms possible for signing the SAP as soon as possible.</li> <li>• The SAP development should reflect the lack of groundwater information and identify means to address this</li> <li>• The lack of community or private sector involvement in the TDA/SAP should be rectified through plans in the SAP to better involve them in future.</li> <li>• The SAP should review the need for pilot actions to assist with implementation.</li> <li>• The SAP should integrate closely with national plans and strategies for content and time-lines to ensure good country ownership</li> </ul>
4	Exit Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Authorities, UNDP CO and RTA should develop a new project for submission to the GEF as a PIF before the end of the project to 'initiate the implementation of the SAP'. Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Institutional strengthening for policy development;</li> <li>○ Further strengthening of the CTWC/Secretariat</li> <li>○ Community actions (including awareness raising aimed at schools, local private sector organisations, farmers, etc.)</li> <li>○ Co-financing for PIF and longer-term for SAP implementation;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The project team should consider holding a final workshop involving many stakeholder groups to highlight the achievements of this project (TDA, SAP etc.) and to raise further awareness of the potential SAP Implementation follow-on project.</li> </ul>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the MTR and objectives

A Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the UNDP-GEF project ‘Enabling Transboundary Co-operation and Integrated Water Resources Management in the Chu and Talas River Basins’ (the UNDP/GEF project) has been undertaken, consistent with the expectations of the GEF and UNDP.

The purpose of the MTR is to enable the Governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, the Regional Co-ordinator, UNDP’s Project Management Unit (PMU), and UNDP Country Offices (CO) in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan to assess the progress and to take any necessary decisions on the remaining activities before project completion, to ensure that the project’s objectives are achieved.

## 1.2 Scope and methodology

This MTR has been undertaken in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) presented in Annex 1 of this report, and has been conducted with reference to UNDP’s guidance on GEF MTRs<sup>1</sup>.

The MTR was designed to assess four categories of project progress including:

- Project strategy;
- Progress towards results;
- Project implementation and adaptive management;
- Sustainability.

Based on the assessment of these four review categories, conclusions and targeted recommendations are presented.

### 1.2.1 Evaluation design, execution and analysis

The ToR (Annex 1) allowed 25 days for undertaking the evaluation including a mission (May 27<sup>th</sup> – June 6<sup>th</sup> 2017) to Bishkek, Taraz and Astana to meet with stakeholders, reviewing documents and preparing draft and final reports. The MTR used material for desk reviews provided by the project team, a mission to Bishkek, Taraz and Astana. A list of documents consulted is presented in Annex 7.

The review categories were elaborated as questions within an evaluation matrix (Annex 2) and supplemented by questions to be directed towards stakeholders during the mission (Annex 3). Where possible, findings were supported with multiple observations.

The project team, based in Bishkek, developed a mission programme in discussion with the MTR consultant that included:

- Meetings with the project regional co-ordinator
- Meetings with UNDP CO in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan
- Discussions with the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)
- Meetings with the key ministerial representatives in both countries
- Meetings with key stakeholders including representatives of the Chu – Talas Water Commission in both countries

---

<sup>1</sup> Guidance for conducting mid-term reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects

- Discussions with key partners (e.g. UNECE, SDC, etc.)
- Discussions with international consultants

The mission (programme presented in Annex 5) was facilitated by a Russian-English interpreter. A list of persons consulted for the MTR is presented in Annex 6.

### 1.2.2 Structure of the MTR report

This MTR report is based on the format suggested in the ToR for this assignment (Annex 1) with the following key sections:

- Section 2: Project Description
- Section 3: Findings (addressing project design, implementation and results)
- Section 4: Conclusions, recommendations and lessons.
- Annexes (including ToR for this assignment, evaluation matrix, mission programme, assessment of outcomes/outputs, etc.)

### 1.2.3 Limitations of the evaluation

As with all evaluations, time has been limited for this review and the project has delivered many and varied outputs that have resulted in only a brief inspection of some documents and reports by the MTR consultant. However, the MTR consultant considers that those inspected have been representative of the outputs as a whole

## 2 Project Description and Background Context

The GEF Medium Size Project (MSP) “*Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins*” facilitates integrated water resources management in the transboundary Chu-Talas basins, including support to the Transboundary Water Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. It is executed by UNDP Kyrgyzstan in a partnership with UNDP Kazakhstan, UNDP IRH and UNECE.

The project responds to the GEF IW Strategic Programme 3 and contributes to the GEF outcome ‘*Transboundary institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management demonstrate sustainability*’.

### 2.1 Development context

The project’s objective is to: ‘Strengthening transboundary cooperation and promoting integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins, and empowering the Water Commission of Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic’ achieved through the attainment of 11 project outcomes and defined project outputs.

The project contributes to UNDAF outcomes presented in the Project Document. The project is also directly in-line with UNDP’s Strategic Plan (2014 – 2017) Outcome 2, contributing to Output 2,5 through indicator 2.5.2 (*Number of countries implementing national and local plans for Integrated Water Resources Management*).

### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The project responds to the threats posed by increasing water consumption and pollution to meet growing social, industrial and agricultural needs, compounded by climatic variability and change. Pressure on scarce water resources and aquatic ecosystems has been growing in recent years across the basins generating risks of conflicts between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan over water allocation.

The project strengthens coordination and expand the role of transboundary institutions in balancing water uses, improving water quality and conservation of aquatic ecosystems, through strengthen monitoring capacity and technologies. It contributes towards the joint management of the water resources of the Chu and Talas river basins. The project builds on the on-going cooperation of the Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan under the Agreement on Use of Interstate Water Management Facilities signed in 2000.

Thu Chu – Taraz Water Commission (CTWC) was established in 2006 and led by two co-chairs in Bishkek and Astana. The work of the commission is supported by two secretariats and joint working groups.

### 2.3 Project description and strategy

The project responds to the regional problems affecting water and ecosystem management through the application of the GEF Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) leading to the development of a regional Strategic Action Plan (SAP). The GEF TDA/SAP approach has been applied to over 30 projects on international transboundary rivers globally over the last 25 years. The project includes the following components:

- **Component 1:** Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analyses to inform adaptive management of the Chu-Talas shared water resources. Component 1 is to deliver four outcomes:
  - Outcome 1: Science based consensus among the countries on major transboundary problems of the basin
  - Outcome 2: Improved understanding of the transboundary implications of the shared nature of the Basins' water resources
  - Outcome 3: Improved knowledge of the consequences of extreme weather situations
  - *Outcome 4:* Capacitated local stakeholders ready to minimize negative consequences for economic sectors as well as the environment in the basin
- **Component 2:** Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water cooperation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP). Component 2 is to deliver 4 outcomes:
  - Outcome 5: Visioning process and agreement on priorities for action opens the way for systematic cooperation in the integrated management of the transboundary Chu Talas River Basins.
  - Outcome 6: Strengthened collaborative mechanism for bilateral cooperation framework or the further improvement of joint management of the Chu and Talas basins.
  - Outcome 7: Steps taken for the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process
  - Outcome 8: Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally
- **Component 3:** Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins. Component 3 is to deliver 3 outcomes:
  - Outcome 9: Improved basis for the dialogue on transboundary water management on the basis of a better understanding of the quantity and quality of water resources, and their variability in the two basins.
  - Outcome 10: Countries capacity built for improved coordinated monitoring
  - Outcome 11: Consensus on joint monitoring activities between the two countries.

The project document defined 13 specific outputs contributing to the above 11 outcomes.

## 2.4 Project budget

The GEF project budget presented at CEO endorsement was:

**Table 3: Project Budget**

Component	GEF Budget USD
Component 1: Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analysis to inform adaptive management of the Chu – Talas shared water resources	300,000
Component 2: Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water co-operation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP)	200,000
Component 3: Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins	400,000
Project Management	100,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>

The GEF grant is supported through planned co-financing of \$ 6,239,397 (from Governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, Swiss Development Co-operation, Government of Finland, Shared Water Partnership, UNECE and UNDP).

Additional information on budget and co-financing is presented in section 3.4.3.

## 2.5 Project implementation arrangements

The project is implemented by UNDP through the Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). UNDP Country Office (CO) in Kyrgyzstan is taking the lead in executing the project, with close co-operation and support of the UNDP CO in Kazakhstan. With a long history of IWRM projects in the region and playing a central role in the establishment of the Chu-Talas Water Commission as well as co-financing this project, UNECE was identified in the GEF documents as a ‘co-executing’ partner with a senior advisory role to the project.

Following the civil unrest in 2010 in Kyrgyzstan, UNDP took the decision to manage all projects through a DIM modality in a dedicated Project Management Unit (PMU), taking into considerations previous NIM capacity and the security issues of multiple small project management teams distributed throughout the country. The PMU hosts a small UNDP-GEF Project Implementation Unit led by a Regional Project Co-ordinator (RPC). The RPC is under the supervision of the PMU, the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (based in IRH) and the UNECE Regional Adviser on Environment.

A Project Board (PB) comprising of senior national ministerial representatives, co-chairs of the Chu – Talas Water Commission, NGO representatives and co-financing partners, was established to oversee and endorse actions of the project.

## 2.6 Project timing and milestones

The project start date is presented in PIRs as the 5<sup>th</sup> May 2015 with the RPC being recruited in August 2015. The planned end-date of the project is 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018. Key milestones of the project are:

- Delivery of the agreed Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (first semester year 2)
- Delivery of the agreed Strategic Action Plan (end of project)
- Agreement between two countries for monitoring and data sharing (end of project)

## 2.7 Main stakeholders

The Project Document identified approximately 40 stakeholder groups ranging from ministries (agriculture, water management, environmental protection, foreign affairs, etc.), water management (dams and reservoirs), co-ordinating institutions (e.g. Chu – Talas Water Commission, Water Policy Dialogue councils, Basin Councils, etc.), local communities, NGOs, Research institutes, Private sector, etc.

The project's focus is largely on institutional development in support of the TDA/SAP process through institutions supporting transboundary IWRM activities.

## 3 Findings

### 3.1 Project strategy

#### 3.1.1 Project design

Both countries have identified that transboundary waters are important to human and ecosystem health and relevant to ensure adequacy of high quality water resources necessary for the ecosystem, human drinking water supply, irrigation and industry. The project design and current implementation are highly relevant to both countries.

The project is aimed at the identification of transboundary problems impacting the Chu – Talas river basins in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan (through a TDA) and to develop an agreed strategy to address these problems (the SAP). The TDA and SAP elaboration is supported through targeted capacity building of national authorities and other involved stakeholders. The GEF TDA and SAP approach has been applied successfully by over 30 GEF IW projects resulting in a growing number of projects focusing on assisting countries to *implement* SAPs leading to national, regional and global ecosystem improvements.

As a MSP, the project is ambitious in undertaking a three-year programme to develop a TDA resulting in a regionally approved SAP, even with only two countries involved. However, a strength of this project has been the significant baseline of activities undertaken by UNECE, OSCE and UNDP over the last 10 years. The project also utilises partnerships (and co-financing) with SDC and the Finnish Government (through the Finnish Environment Agency) addressing issues of water quantity and quality respectively, enabling this UNDP-GEF project to focus on providing targeted support on institutional strengthening through the TDA/SAP process.

The project builds upon, and further supports the development of, the Chu – Talas Water Commission (CTWC) established (in 2006) by the Kazakhstan/Kyrgyzstan '*Agreement on Use of Interstate Water Management Facilities*' signed in 2000. The CTWC has held 23 meetings to-date. The agreement has provided a bilateral governance structure that is supported by the project through all three components. The CTWC is led by two national co-chairs with support from two secretariats and bilateral Working Groups providing technical direction. The CTWC, the Secretariats and the Working Groups (the Environment Protection WG and, the Adapting to Climate Change and SAP WG) have all received project support through their inputs to the TDA, SAP and meetings. Further project support is provided to national Inter-ministerial co-ordination committees.

The project design included a Project Board as the main decision-making body. The Project Board meetings are held (twice per year) back-to-back with the CTWC meetings, benefiting from broad participation of ministerial, institutes and civil society (through NGOs). The chair of the Project Board is one of the co-chair of the CTWC from the country where the meeting is held. Co-financing (SDC, Finnish Government, SWP) and executing partners (UNDP and UNECE) are also invited.

During the mission, the MTR consultant was repeatedly informed that the UNDP-GEF Chu – Talas project was highly appreciated by both countries as being important to the environment, national development and cross-border co-operation, and that the planned work is directly relevant to the work of the countries and CTWC. For example, the project has assisted to promote goals of Kazakhstan to implement green initiatives in the Kazakhstan Strategy 2050 and is consistent with the approach to water management 2040.

The Project Document had little references to specific action relating to gender issues other than the development of a strategy for stakeholder engagement that also included gender.

### 3.1.2 Results framework

The MTR consultant considers the design of the project (three components delivering 11 outcomes) to be unnecessarily complicated for this type of project. For example, the first three outcomes under component 1 (relating to the TDA) could better be presented as a single outcome: ‘improving the science based knowledge of the transboundary basins reflecting climate change scenarios’. This rather confused structure has not help explain the project to stakeholders and the project team is using the three components effectively as the overarching outcomes for the project as a means to simplify the project. From a pragmatic perspective, reporting the achievements of 11 outcomes places a greater burden on the project management from the more usual 3/4 outcomes that a typical GEF TDA/SAP project with a 1 M\$ budget.

In addition to these comments relating to the 11 outcomes of this project, the MTR has the following observations on the results framework:

- The results framework did not include targets for the mid-term assessment;
- The Inception meeting reviewed the overall project design and the project results framework. Few changes were suggested. However, a more significant change to the project design was the elimination of the assessments and planning of groundwaters from the TDA/SAP. This change has not reflected in any modification to the project results framework.
- Whilst the results framework is logical it would benefit from a review at this stage, for example, strengthening the targets with achievable metrics to assist the final evaluations (e.g. numbers of participants with gender disaggregated data).
- The gender team within the UNDP PMU has been helping to improve the ‘gender relevance’ of activities presented in the 2017 work plans. The MTR considers that it would be beneficial if these enhancements were reflected in the revision of the project results framework.
- Output 2.1 (SAP – ‘ministerial endorsement’) and to a less extent, output 3.4 (agreement on co-ordinated monitoring) are largely beyond the direct control of the project. Political approval as an outcome not as an output (as presented in the results framework) is more realistic. The MTR considers that these two targets do not qualify as ‘realistic or achievable’ (SMART). Typically for a SAP the focus for approval is on the ‘*highest level possible*’ within governments. Both outcomes are likely to be technically approved within the lifetime of the project by the CTWC and recommended for national endorsement
- The inception phase also did not identify any further risks to the project execution beyond those presented in the Project Document.

## 3.2 Progress towards results

### 3.3 Assessment of the GEF IW Tracking Tool

GEF IW Tracking Tool (TT) prepared at CEO endorsement has been compared with the TT prepared at mid-term. Positive changes reflect the development and approval of the TDA, the national functioning IMCs and the implementation of a monitoring system, for example. The project is expected to submit a final TT and this will include updates including the development of the SAP and an IW:LEARN compliant website (in partnership with the CTWC).

As an observation on the Tracking Tool, the MTR consultants note that there have been changes between the version of the TT used at inception and the current version (at mid-term). Whilst these changes are relatively minor (exclusion of a few indicators), it does hinder the ability of the TT to *track* progress effectively. It would be beneficial if the same version of the TT was used throughout the project.

#### 3.3.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis

Discussions with a wide range of stakeholders have indicated that although the project was slow initially to gain momentum there has been a steady progress as indicated in Annex 8 on an assessment of the project outputs and outcomes. All stakeholders considered that the project's objective and outcomes will be largely achieved without a prolongation of the project, with technical approval by the CTWC of the SAP and the agreement on monitoring and data exchange.

#### **Assessment of progress:**

**Project Objective:** Strengthening transboundary cooperation and promoting integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins, and empowering the Water Commission of Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic

Whilst the project had a slow start it is now considered, by stakeholders and the UNDP PMU, to be largely on-track for completion by June 2018 as planned. Overall the delivery of targets associated with objective level indicators are at a relatively low percentage of completeness, corresponding to the dependency of these targets on the approval of final products of the project (output 2.1 SAP; output 2.4 on government agreement on the CTWC mandate; and, 3.4 national agreement on co-ordinated monitoring and data exchange). This approval will come initially from the Co-Chairs of the CTWC (technical approval) before further political approval. The procedure for political approval in both countries should be established by project team.

**Component 1:** Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analysis to inform adaptive management of the Chu – Talas shared water resources

The project has completed the TDA (approved by CTWC) but the document is still to be finalised for publication. The development of the TDA was overseen by an international consultant to guide the process in-line with the GEF recommended approach to TDA/SAP. Both countries have acknowledged to the MTR consultant the importance of this analysis and the effective means in which it was designed and developed.

Capacity development has been undertaken in support of the TDA, and the involvement of national consultants (and national hydro-metrological institutes), has been much appreciated by both countries. This will assist with the sustaining of the monitoring and

assessment procedures initiated by the TDA. Although a potential concern raised by a national stakeholder is the loss from government institutes of trained staff seeking improved salaries in private sector organisations. The project has supported joint monitoring programmes at transboundary location and the sampling/analysis of samples taken at multiple sites throughout the basin on a quarterly basis. Both SDC and the Finnish Environment Agency, through their co-financing activities, have facilitated the water quantity and water quality actions respectively.

In co-operation with UNECE's regional climate change adaptation project, funded by Finland through its FinWaterWei II programme (co-financing contribution to this project), national reports on the impacts of climate change have been prepared. Furthermore, at its 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, CTWC approved the preparation of an annex to TDA on climate change adaptation. The work on the annex has already been initiated by UNECE, in close cooperation with the GEF project.

This component (including outcomes 1 -3) has effectively been completed. Outcome 4 (output 1.3) is being undertaken linked to the UNECE work and is estimated as 80% complete by the project team.

**Component 2:** Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water co-operation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP)

Significant work on the SAP (output 2.1) has only recently commenced (at the time of the mid-term review). As is often experienced with GEF IW TDA/SAP projects, more time is spent on the TDA than planned. To-date, national meetings have been held to identify potential visions for the SAP followed by a regional meeting to agree a common vision and goals. The development of a SAP is being facilitated by an international consultant through a training programme using GEF IW:LEARN guidance and on-going work to assist in the development of the SAP.

The project is assisting with Inter-ministerial Co-ordination (IMC) (output 2.2) through the organisations of multiple meetings that discuss a number of GEF projects at differing stages of development (typically meetings are held twice per year in Kyrgyzstan). This activity is also supported through UNECE's National Policy Dialogues (NPDs) activities through co-financing actions. The GEF project provides updates on its activities at the regional NPD Steering Committee meetings, benefiting from a wide range of participating stakeholders.

The CTWC and the project have identified the Sava Commission as a relevant organisation to gain experiences from through planned 'twinning' (output 2.5) activities. A study tour was organised to the Sava Commission in 2016. This was considered highly beneficial and informative by key stakeholders in both countries. The Sava Commission experts will be involved in on-going actions to support the CTWC through output 3.2.

The project is supporting two NGOs from each country to participate at project meetings including the Project Board. Whilst this is laudable, the project design is limited on direct NGO or community involvement in the project activities. The development of the SAP should recognise the importance of these groups (and, for example, private sector organisations including farmers' associations) in the overall management of water and ecosystem resources, and strengthening livelihoods of the people in the region.

The project has been redeveloping the CTWC website following guidance from GEF IW:LEARN. As emphasised elsewhere, the GEF requires IW projects to have a functional website that includes details of the project and outputs. The lack of a current project website does inhibit information sharing and awareness raising of the project's actions to a wide audience. This is also required to be reported to the GEF via the GEF IW Tracking Tool.

Key observations raised by the countries that should be reflected in the SAP include:

- The regional SAP is expected to have a time-horizon of 20 years for implementation. Both countries expressed concern over this long-period as being beyond the normal planning windows of ministries. For example, in Kazakhstan, state policies cover 10 years and ministerial policies typically cover five years. It will be important in the development of the SAP to take account of these national planning cycles, and ensure that the SAP measures coincide with national action plans and ministerial strategies through the identification of appropriate short, medium and long-term measure in the SAP.
- Both countries identified that it was key to develop an appropriate 'SAP implementation' plan to ensure that the SAP does not remain a paper output and leads to transformation changes at all levels of water management in the countries. There is demand from all stakeholders for UNDP to begin the process of developing a follow-on project to assist with the initiation of the SAP implementation.
- In developing the institutional and policies changes needed in the SAP, both countries stressed the importance of ensuring that actions are appropriate for Kyrgyzstan/Kazakhstan and do not adopt a 'cut and paste' approach from other regions.
- Monitoring facilities in Kyrgyzstan (laboratories, equipment, consumables, capacity) are limited and require upgrading. The lack of such facilities will inhibit the sustainability of the project's efforts to encourage joint monitoring and the necessary upgrading should be highlighted in the SAP.
- Sampling and analytical methods have been recently updated in Kazakhstan to international ISO standards. The SAP should encourage the adoption of these standards in Kyrgyzstan to further harmonise approaches.
- The technical approval of the SAP will be undertaken by the CTWC under the guidance of the co-chairs. However, obtaining the political approval will require further work by the project and the CTWC co-chairs.
- During the inception phase, references to groundwater activities (outputs 1.2 and 3.1) were removed, focusing just on surface water. Both countries identified that information on groundwater resources, utilisation and threats should be noted in the SAP for future actions to address these gaps in knowledge in basin water resources.

### **Component 3:** Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins

The focus of this capacity-strengthening component to support the TDA/SAP development process and to provide capacity for the longer-term (post-project) monitoring of the Chu – Talas basin that aid the sustainability of the project's actions. The main beneficiaries of this component are the hydrometeorology organisations in both countries. The institutional strengthening capacity building actions by the project link with the support offered by the

SDC's (on water quantity) and the Finnish Environment Agency's (water quality) co-financing actions.

Assessment reports (output 3.1) on water resources have been prepared through drafting groups supported by the project to prepare national and joint reports. These reports assisted with the TDA and will guide the SAP formulation.

Training programmes to assist the countries undertake monitoring and data exchange (outputs 3.2 and 3.3) are planned and will be closely linked to support from the Sava Commission experts that will share good practices on water management. The involvement of the Sava Commission is considered to be highly beneficial by all stakeholders bringing relevant and recent experiences to the region through south – south co-operation processes.

Output 3.4 will develop a formal agreement between the two countries on monitoring and data exchange, but has yet to be significantly advanced. The MTR anticipates that technical agreeing protocols on monitoring and data exchange will be possible in the life-time of the project, the formal national approval may take longer.

Two outputs have been delayed (output 1.3 Seminars on climate change adaptation and output 2.4 revision of CTWC statutes) and were expected by the first semester of year two. These activities are anticipated to be completed soon.

Two training sessions on climate change related issues were held at the end of 2016, jointly with the UNECE regional project on climate change adaptation. Training on climate change scenarios and adaptation measures was held on 29 November back to back with the CTWC meeting. Training on water quality and health in the context of climate change was held on 8 December back-to-back with the NPD Steering Committee meeting.

Based on an analysis of the progress on project outputs and outcomes (Annex 8), discussion with stakeholders and INDP / project staff, the MTR consultant assesses the Project Objectives and Components (integrating the 11 outcomes in the overarching components) is expected meet the following ratings *by the end-of-project*, as:

- Project Objective            Satisfactory
- Component 1:                Satisfactory
- Component 2:                Satisfactory
- Component 3:                Satisfactory

As emphasised above, Outcomes 5 and 11 (corresponding to outputs 2.1 and 3.4) SAP and monitoring agreement are over ambitious as presented in the Project Results Framework, however as also stated, the MTR considers that clear steps will be taken to obtain *technical* approval of the related outputs by the CTWC Co-Chairs.

#### **Demonstration of relevance of project's support to CTWC**

The state programme on Agricultural production of Kazakhstan (2017 -2020) addresses international water and co-operation with neighbouring countries. The state programme cites the co-operation between in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan in the Chu – Talas river basins through the CTWC as an example of a functioning joint body within a bilateral agreement, and the CTWC is a model to help downstream countries be engaged in management of dams and other hydrotechnical installations located on upstream countries territories.

### 3.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The MTR consultant considered the following issues as potential barriers that may impact the delivery of the project's objective:

- **SAP endorsement.** There is still a lack of clarity over the final endorsement of the SAP. The MTR consultant was informed that in Kazakhstan the Minister will not sign the SAP as they approve strategic plans for ministries not individual 'plans'. An option would be to get the SAP integrated within ministerial strategies as part of the National Action Plan. Other options which are being explored by the project team are through the existing Intergovernmental Panel on Cross-border Co-operation led by the Prime Ministers or Vice-Prime Ministers.
- **Formal agreement of the joint monitoring sites:** The project has undertaken several joint monitoring campaigns, where samples are taken simultaneously at border points. Formal approval and agreement is still needed although from a practical perspective samples are being taken. As emphasised above the project is likely to receive formal agreement on the locations from the CTWC co-chairs, but formal governmental agreement (as with the SAP) may take longer than the time available until project closure

## 3.4 Project implementation and adaptive management

### 3.4.1 Management arrangements

An innovative and effective means has been established within the UNDP CO in Bishkek to manage this (and other) projects through a Project Management Unit (PMU). By combining the multiple projects under a single PMU, UNDP has developed a model system that provides broad technical and administrative support for individual projects whilst maintaining a clear oversight and supervision role for UNDP in the executing role. The PMU includes over 50 staff on a range of projects. The strength of this approach is seen by the UNDP-GEF projects access to gender involvement (see below), procurement specialist and financial expertise. This approach has enabled the project to be implemented with a small team of 'shared', but dedicated project staff.

The project is under the day-to-day management of the Regional Co-ordinator under the authority of the PMU Dimension Chief. A Project Board meeting is held twice a year in conjunction with the CTWC meetings ensuring good participation of key government and NGO stakeholders. The CTWC include representatives of multiple ministries including the Ministries of Foreign Affairs from both Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. UNDP RTA and both COs, UNECE actively participate in these meetings, and key co-financing partners (e.g. SDC, Finnish Environment Agency, SWP, etc.) are also invited to participate.

The Regional Co-ordinator is supported by a Technical Assistant (50% - shared with another PMU project) with financial/administrative support from within the PMU. A water quality expert (50%) from the UNDP Kazakhstan CO has recently been added to the team. Detailed oversight, including QA functions are performed regularly by the UNDP CO and PMU.

All ToRs for services are reviewed by the PMU's gender team to ensure they conform to UNDP practices and to further promote gender mainstreaming within the project's activities. The gender marker at approval was presented as '1' however, this has been recently upgraded to gender marker

'2' by the UNDP PMU gender team as a means of encouraging further and more substantial gender issue involvement (for example in the planned training sessions to be given under the SAP development). The MTR consultant considers the proactive involvement of the PMU's gender team to be a significant benefit to strengthen the project impact, and to assist UNDP and GEF meet gender inclusion targets.

### 3.4.2 Work planning

As noted above the project was subject to delays following start-up, however stakeholders and UNDP/ project staff consider that the substantial elements of the project will be delivered prior to June 2018.

Annual work plans (AWPs) are developed by the Regional Co-ordinator and approved by UNDP CO indicating clear timelines for the main activities delivering project outputs. The Project Board approve outputs, proposed budgets and the overall workplan for the next period. Following approval, the Regional Co-ordinator with the Dimension Chief ensure that the programme is executed according to the plan.

Progress on the project results framework is reported on annually through the PIRs to the GEF and quarterly to UNDP. This mid-term review should act as a catalyst to update the results framework to remove elements that have been deleted by Project Board Meetings (e.g. groundwater issues) and to enhance the definition of targets where possible (improve metrics, utilise more gender specific elements as included in the work plans by the gender team, etc.). (See Section 3.1.2)

### 3.4.3 Finance and co-finance

The budget approved at CEO endorsement (and reconfirmed at the Inception Meeting) is presented in Table 4 at the Component level. Figures for Output level actual spends are presented for 2015 and 2016 with AWP budget presented for 2017.

**Table 4: Project Finances**

Output	Total Budget approved (at Inception) K USD	Utilised budget (2015) K USD	Utilised budget (2016) k USD	AWP (2017) k USD	Budget (2018*) k USD
<b>Component 1: Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analysis to inform adaptive management of the Chu – Talas shared water resources</b>					
1.1 TDA		21 998	95 000	45 403	
1.2 Scenarios for water futures		17 500	41 269	9 900	
1.3 Seminars on climate change adaptation		6 000	22 488	23 402	
<b>Total per Component 1</b>	<b>300 000</b>	<b>45 498</b>	<b>158 757</b>	<b>78 705</b>	<b>17 040</b>
<b>Component 2: Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water co-operation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP)</b>					
2.1 SAP				59 600	
2.2 Inter-ministerial Co-ordination Committees		3 277	26 038	21500	
2.3 Stakeholder involvement					

Output	Total Budget approved (at Inception) K USD	Utilised budget (2015) K USD	Utilised budget (2016) k USD	AWP (2017) k USD	Budget (2018*) k USD
2.4 Revised statutes for CTWC			3 000	9 000	
2.5 Twinings (with the Sava Commission)			35 412	11 200	
2.6 Website compatible with GEF IW:LEARN			4 600	4 000	
<b>Total per Component 2</b>	<b>200 000</b>	<b>3 277</b>	<b>69 050</b>	<b>105 300</b>	<b>21 700</b>
<b>Component 3: Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins</b>					
3.1 Assessment of surface and GW <sup>2</sup> quantity /quality			90 900	69 000	
3.2 Training on monitoring and data exchange		2 639	8 033	101 265	
3.3 Training on joint monitoring					
3.4 Agreement on co-ordinated monitoring and data exchange			8 600	76 000	
<b>Total per Component 3</b>	<b>400 000</b>	<b>2 639</b>	<b>107 537</b>	<b>246 265</b>	<b>44 232</b>
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>900 000</b>	<b>51 414</b>	<b>335 344</b>	<b>430 270</b>	<b>82 972</b>

2018\* - prediction (no AWP until Jan 2018)

The status of co-financing information linked to the project (provided by the Regional Co-ordinator) at the time of the MTR (June 2017) is presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Project Co-financing**

Source	Type of funding	Co-financing approved at CEO endorsement k USD	Amount (June 2017) k USD	%age delivered
Government of Kazakhstan	In-kind	750	525	70
Government of Kyrgyzstan	In-kind	1,170	819	70
Government of Finland	Cash and in-kind	1,314	788	60
Swiss Development Co-operation	Cash	2,22	1.11	50
Shared Water Partnership	Cash	65.427	65.427	100
UNECE	Cash and in-kind	440	264	60
UNDP	In-kind	300	180	60
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,239</b>	<b>3,751</b>	<b>60</b>

<sup>2</sup> Groundwater issues were deleted from the project during the inception meeting. However, the project results framework and the PIRs still include the original wording reproduced here

No additional co-financing sources have been added. The contribution of co-financing funds is in-line with the mid-term of the project. There are no notable variations in budget since the start. UNDP CO through the PMU exerts a strong financial control of the project. The project is subject to annual audit under the Kyrgyzstan UNDP CO procedures of the overall PMU.

#### 3.4.4 Project-level monitoring and evaluation system

The Project Document had a standard UNDP M&E plan presented including quarter and annual reports, GEF PIRs, Project Board meetings and evaluations. GEF's IW Tracking Tool was submitted at CEO Endorsement and again at the mid-term (see section 3.3). The indicative cost was presented as approximately 5% of the total GEF grant. The MTR Consultant considers that the M&E provisions as planned were consistent with the needs of effective and efficient project delivery and sufficient to monitor the achievement of progress.

The MTE consultant has commented (Section 3.1.2) on the need to review the results framework to adopt changes agreed in the inception phase and to further enhance the 'SMART' nature of indicators.

The MTR has viewed a selection of reports, including inception, PIRs, AWP, etc. which seem to present a realistic report of the project's progress. The MTR consultant considers that the reports of the Project Board meetings (minutes) are particularly brief and recommends more details are included in future to understand the issues. The MTR consultant recognises that the Project Board meetings are held back-to-back with the CTWC meetings and detailed discussions on the project's activities are included in the Commission's meetings. It would be beneficial to include a summary of the discussions, relating to the UNDP-GEF project at the CTWC meeting as part of the minutes of the Project Board.

The project has benefited from the significant in-house M&E activities that the UNDP CO undertakes in monitoring the delivery of projects within the PMU. The frequent internal meetings enable the project to take any corrective actions required and, through the gender team for example, to increase the gender elements of this project (see Section 3.4.1).

#### 3.4.5 Stakeholder engagement

The project has good links and close collaboration with the CTWC, secretariats of the commission and, water/environment related ministries and ministries of foreign affairs. This is to be expected in a project that is trying to promote transboundary water management. The strength of the project's links with national stakeholders was conveyed to the MTR consultant in multiple meetings with government representatives. UNDP should be commended for the many positive statements with respect to the project (and in particular, towards the Regional Co-ordinator). However, it was clear from the meetings that there is still more to be done in explaining, for example, the SAP to senior officials, despite their attendance at Project Board Meetings, etc.

The UNECE facilitated NPDs also provide opportunities to broaden the discussions to additional stakeholders. Although the Project Board does include two NGOs from each country there has not been a significant emphasis on community involvement in the development of the TDA or the planning of the SAP. There has also not been much work to promote the role of the private sector (including farmers' associations) in project activities. In developing the SAP the project should try to ensure all sectors of the population are represented.

As emphasised above, the lack of a functional and informative project website has not assisted in public engagement or awareness of the many important goals and achievements of the project. This will also help improve the transparency of the project's work that is perceived from some partners where reports prepared by national consultants have not been made available. A functional website (possibly including a password-protected section on work-in-progress) would also help ensure that stakeholders based, for example, in Taraz feel fully engaged in the project.

#### 3.4.6 Reporting

The project (in accordance with the CEO endorsed M&E plan) prepares frequent reports quarterly, annually and prepares the expected PIRs. Reporting is also conducted with national stakeholders to brief them on progress through the Project Board meeting and by copy of appropriate reports sent to UNDP-GEF. Co-financing partners are copied to all substantive reports.

As indicated above (Section 3.4.2), the Project Board reports are very superficial, although they contain a summary of the decisions it would be beneficial if a brief account of the project related discussions at the CTWC meeting are included.

The project website (when launched in August) will also assist with ensuring all reports are available to the wide range of stakeholders engaged in this project.

#### 3.4.7 Communications

The main communications channels have been with the CTWC, Project Board meetings and NPD meetings. This is where key stakeholders receive an overview of the project's activities and performance. To-date, the project does not have a website: a requirement of all GEF IW projects.

During the MTR mission, several comments were received from senior national representatives that they did not fully understand aspects of the project. The project should provide additional descriptions of the SAP and how this can/will link to national action plans or specific ministry strategies (clear, simple and brief)

The project website (when launched in August) will also assist with communicating and raising awareness with all stakeholders, including with civil society

### 3.5 Sustainability

There appear to have been limited discussions at the national level on the sustainability of the work being undertaken by the project. The project team should consider as part of an exit strategy, to identify means (including follow-on projects with multiple sources of financing, a final project meeting to highlight the SAP, national commitments, CTWC funding routes, etc.), means to sustain the CTWC and the SAP implementation.

#### 3.5.1 Financial risks to sustainability

In Kyrgyzstan, there is a lack of financial resources to support the CTWC Co-Chair and the secretariat (although the CTWC Co-Chair is a state employee). Currently the CTWC secretariat in Kyrgyzstan are 'volunteers' and supported by the project, either through consultant contracts to assist with TDA/SAP activities or travel disbursements to attend meetings. There is also a lack of laboratory

infrastructure in Kyrgyzstan (equipment, consumables, etc.) and no long-term budget provision to continue the monitoring programmes that are supported by the project.

In Kazakhstan, the Co-Chair and secretariat of the Commission are supported from the State budget.

The overall **financial** sustainability of the regional project is rated by the MTR consultant as **Moderately Unlikely**

### 3.5.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability

The work of the project is firmly embedded in the key ministries/institutes responsible for environment and water management in both countries. The work is highly aligned with the stated objectives of the countries with regards to transboundary water resources. Clearly the downstream country (Kazakhstan) has much to gain from the improved management of water resources in the upstream country (Kyrgyzstan). This could impact the willingness to share information on water quantity and quality, although to-date both countries have undertaken a joint TDA and monitoring programme and are embarking on the joint development of the SAP.

Through the SAP (and SAP implementation) the MTR anticipates that there would be significant benefits to the socio-economic conditions within the Basins. The SAP will enable priority issues to be addressed that are currently impacting negatively on the ecosystem and livelihoods of the population in the region, specifically, on water quality or quantity of surface waters.

As mentioned throughout this report, there is insufficient involvement or information provided to civil society and private sector groups.

The overall **social-economic** sustainability of the regional project is rated by the MTR consultant as **Moderately Likely**

### 3.5.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The SAP (and subsequent SAP implementation) is likely to have a significant focus on strengthening the governance arrangements and institutional capacities associated of the CTWC.

The CTWC agreement has provision for the establishment of a body (or bodies) as a legal entity, which would facilitate the CTWC ability to receive financial resources. There is significant support in both countries to establish the commission as a legal entity, and the project is assisting with a review of the steps required.

The ongoing involvement of the Sava Commission, following a high-level study tour in 2016 to Zagreb, will assist with the further development of the institutional and governance structures and aid the operation and sustainability of the CTWC.

Recently Kazakhstan adopted ISO methodologies (in 2013) however, in Kyrgyzstan standards and methods from the Soviet era are still being used. Whilst initial results apparently show reasonable agreement it would be beneficial if both countries adopted comparable standards for sampling and analysis. Previous work before the adoption of ISO methods in Kazakhstan (under support from UNECE 2010 -2013) common methods were used. There is also an urgent need to upgrade laboratories in Kyrgyzstan that should be addressed in the SAP.

The overall **institutional framework** sustainability of the regional project is rated by the MTR consultant as **Moderately Likely** in Kazakhstan and **Moderately Unlikely** in Kyrgyzstan.

#### 3.5.4 Environmental risks to sustainability

The key environmental issue expected to impact the region is climate change. The project is using the best available information to guide climate change scenarios to plan for appropriate adaptation measures. As mentioned above, a work is ongoing on the annex to TDA on climate change adaptation to be prepared by UNECE in cooperation with the GEF project. The work on adaptation measures can be informed by the ongoing work within the UNECE regional project on the prioritization of basin-wide adaptation measures. In addition, the SAP will develop management actions to respond to pollution (municipal, agricultural and industrial) that have been identified in the TDA, eventually leading to a reduction of the pollution in the region.

The overall **environmental** sustainability of the regional project is rated by the MTR consultant as **Moderately Likely**

## 4 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 4.1 Conclusions

The following conclusions are considered by the MTR consultant as being significant.

#### General

12. The project is closely aligned with the priorities of the countries to strengthen cross-border co-operation on IWRM. National stakeholders consider that the main outputs achieved (and planned) for the project are of considerable value to the governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan.
13. Ministry stakeholders consider the project to be well managed and executed and is expected to reach key objectives as planned.

#### Project Design

14. The execution arrangements (through UNDP CO, the PMU and the PIU/Regional Co-ordinator) are considered by the MTR consultant as effective and efficient. The PMU (managing a number of projects) offers significant advantages for small projects (such as the UNDP-GEF Chu – Talas project), enabling PMU shared resource expertise (e.g. gender, QA, procurement, finance, etc.) facilitating good regional project management. These resources would not normally be readily assessible to a small project team. The lead UNDP CO (in Bishkek) and the UNDP CO based in Astana both stated there was a good working relationship.
15. The project has been designed with 3 components delivering 11 outcomes with some replication/overlap on some outcomes. This is considered too complex for the size and nature of the project by the MTR Consultant.
16. The Project Results Framework is overly ambitious with outputs expecting ministerial endorsement (e.g. the SAP). The MTR consultant would expect the project to realistically achieve ‘technical’ approval of key outputs from the Co-Chairs of the CTWC in the life of the project. Political approval as an outcome not as an output (as presented in the results framework) is more realistic.
17. The project has benefited from the previous (and ongoing) work of UNECE in assisting with a strong baseline of work and facilitating core actions associated with climate change scenarios. The strong reputation of UNECE with ministerial stakeholders has greatly assisted this project.

#### Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)/ Strategic Action Programme (SAP)

18. The TDA has been a key output and an opportunity to strengthen capacity in both countries. The results of the TDA have been accepted by both governments through the Co-chairs of the CTWC. The co-operation between national experts has also been a route to improve the sustainability of the bilateral co-operation.
19. Although the main activities are just beginning on the SAP, the preparatory mission to the Sava Commission in 2016 and the expected further collaboration and co-operation with the Sava Commission to assist with the strengthening of the CTWC is considered by all as highly beneficial. This will aid the development and subsequent implementation of the SAP.

## Communications

20. While adequate project briefings are provided during the Project Board Meetings and through the CTWC meetings, there were signs that some senior ministerial stakeholders would benefit from more frequent and clearer information on key topics, including the SAP for example.
21. The lack of a current project website is inhibiting effective dissemination of results or raising awareness.
22. There is relatively little publicity material available on the project and key results.

## Stakeholders engagement

23. Whilst there has been good involvement of stakeholders through the Project Board and other meetings, there has been little direct engagement with civil society including communities or the private sector.
24. UNDP's gender team within the PMU has been proactive in enhancing actions within the project's activities resulting in an increase in the 'gender marker' classification of the project.

## 4.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to the project team (regional co-ordinator and PMU)

### Project Results Framework

The MTR consultant **recommends** that the project team undertake a review of the project results framework to:

- Ensure that the results framework clearly represents the currently expected and agreed activities (for example, to delete the references to groundwater issues);
- Take the opportunity of this review to add more specific metrics where possible (for example, numbers of persons attending meetings, disaggregated by sex, etc.)
- Strengthen the project through the inclusion of clear gender issues as developed in annual workplans.

### Communications

The MTR consultant **recommends** that the project team undertake strengthen communication efforts by:

- Ensuring that the project website is operational (in Russian and English) as soon as possible. A concept for the new CTWC website has been approved but the MTR consultants recommends that a dedicated section of this website is provided for the project to present basic project information, consultants outputs, the TDA/SAP etc. The GEF expects that all IW projects provide a website within their first few months of operation to encourage uptake and awareness of the project. This is expected to be reported in the IW Tracking Tool.
- Links should be made from the website to previous GEF Small Grants Projects that have undertaken related work in the region (for example in Kazakhstan a series of community videos have been prepared addressing drip-irrigation, bio-gas, etc.)
- The project should provide clear information about the SAP, SAP implementation, linkages with National Action Plans as briefings to senior ministerial representatives to facilitate the launch of the SAP.

- The reports on the Project Board meetings should be more informative and include a summary of the discussions held within the CTWC meetings to ensure that the context of the conclusions of the Project Board are clear.

### **Strategic Action Programme**

The MTR consultant **recommends** that the project team (including the SAP consultants) consider the following issues in developing the SAP:

- The importance of the SAP signing to any follow-on project is well appreciated by UNDP and the project team and there are several options that they are pursuing. It was made clear to the MTR consultant by senior ministerial representatives that ‘ministers do not sign’ such SAPs. However, by including SAPs (and their respective NAPs) in ministry’s strategies maybe an option of endorsement ‘at the ministerial level’. The MTR consultant further urges the project team to clarify the national mechanisms possible for signing the SAP as soon as possible.
- Although groundwater issues were deleted from this project during the inception phases, it is important that the SAP recognises the gap in information in the current TDA and the planning process and highlights the need to address these gaps during SAP implementation.
- There has been little engagement with communities (civil society organisations, or schools) or the private sector across the river basins in this project. The SAP should acknowledge the importance of these groups in the future sustainable implementation of the SAP and develop plans to better involve them in future.
- The current project has not benefited from results from pilot demonstration actions to address some of the gaps in the TDA or to inform the SAP on appropriate actions. The SAP should recognise the need for small scale pilots that provide opportunities for upscaling/replication across the Chu-Talas basins as a means of engaging communities, farmers, academics, government representatives etc. to further encourage wide stakeholder involvement.
- The importance of ensuring that the timescales of the SAP implementation are closely linked with national action plans and strategies was stressed in both countries. The SAP is working on a horizon of 20 years for implementation; ministerial strategies are typically over 5 or 10 years. It will be imperative that the SAP development team takes note of existing or expected national plans or strategies to ensure linkages to short, medium and long-term management action plans within the SAP. This will further assist the approval of the SAP through ‘mainstreaming’ the SAP within NAPs or national strategies.

### **Exit Strategy**

The MTR consultant **recommends** that the project team develop appropriate plans for an ‘Exit Strategy’ for the project including:

- All stakeholders wished to see the SAP being implemented and recognised the need for further assistance to transform the agreed SAP into a clear ‘implementation plan’. The MTR consultant recommends that National Authorities, UNDP CO and RTA develop a new project for submission to the GEF as a PIF before the end of the project to ‘initiate the implementation of the SAP’. Suggested key issues to be addressed in a SAP implementation project suggested by stakeholders could include:
  - Institutional strengthening, especially at senior policy level development;

- Further strengthening of the CTWC/Secretariat to assist with establishing the commission on a sustainable basis with the future capacity to implement projects;
- Addressing groundwater knowledge gaps;
- Community actions (including awareness raising aimed at schools, local private sector organisations, farmers, etc.)
- National and regional pilots on water management.
- Identifying, as part of the SAP development co-financing actions and partners for the short and medium-term aspects of the SAP that can be further explored in the development of a SAP implementation project;
- The MTR recommends that the project team consider holding a final workshop involving many stakeholder groups to highlight the achievements of this project (TDA, SAP etc.) and to raise further awareness of the potential SAP Implementation follow-on project

## ANNEXES

- Annex 1: Consultant's Terms of Reference for MTR
- Annex 2: Evaluation matrix
- Annex 3: Stakeholder interview guide
- Annex 4: MTR ratings
- Annex5: MTR agenda
- Annex 6: Stakeholders involved in MTR
- Annex 7: Documents reviewed
- Annex 8: MTR's assessment of Outcomes/Outputs
- Annex 9: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations/Mid-Term Reviews

## Annex 1 – Consultant’s Terms of Reference

### International Consultant to conduct Mid-Term Evaluation of the GEF Chu-Talas IWRM Project

#### BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

**Location:** Kyrgyzstan

**Application Deadline:** April 27, 2017

**Category:** Energy and Environment

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Assignment Type:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** approx. May 3, 2017

Duration of Initial Contract: 25 effective person-days

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** Estimated 25 effective person-days during May-June 2017 (17 effective person-days home based and 8 effective person-days on field mission to Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), Astana and Taraz (Kazakhstan))

#### BACKGROUND

##### A. Project Title

UNDP-GEF “Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in Chu-and Talas River Basins” Project

##### B. Project Description

The GEF Medium Size Project (MSP) “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins” enables integrated water resources management in the transboundary Chu-Talas basins, including support to the Transboundary Water Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. It is under implementation of UNDP Kyrgyzstan in a partnership with UNDP Kazakhstan, UNDP IRH and UNECE.

The project responds to the threats posed by increasing water consumption to meet growing social, industrial and agricultural needs, compounded by climatic variability and change. Pressure on scarce water resources and aquatic ecosystems has been growing in recent years across the basins generating risks of conflicts between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan over water allocation.

The project strengthens coordination and expand the role of transboundary institutions in balancing water uses and improving water quality and conservation of aquatic ecosystems, and strengthen monitoring capacity and technologies. It contributes towards the joint management of the water resources of the Chu and Talas river basins. The project builds on the on-going cooperation of the Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan under the Agreement on Use of Interstate Water Management Facilities signed in 2000.

The project includes the following components:

- ✓ **Component 1:** Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analyses to inform adaptive management of the Chu-Talas shared water resources;
- ✓ **Component 2:** Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water cooperation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) ;
- ✓ **Component 3:** Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins.

The GEF Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme Manual<sup>1</sup> guides development of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and the Strategic Action Programme (TDA&SAP), those are foreseen to be developed within the project (**Components 1 and 2**).

Employed International TDA Consultant, first, held training on TDA/SAP methodology for the group of nominated officers from the leading Governmental Institutions in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and then led the work on the review of available data and information, then in cooperation with employed national experts from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and under the supervision of the Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) have developed the preliminary draft TDA.

The preliminary draft TDA had been considered at the Extended Meeting of the Secretariat of ChuTalas Water Commission (CTWC) on July 14-15 2016. The draft TDA was recommended for presenting to the next 22nd Session of CTWC in November 2016 and the Commission at said meeting accepted it.

Decision to develop the SAP was also adopted by CTWC at its 22<sup>nd</sup> Session on November 30, 2017. For this purpose, CTWC has authorized its Secretariat to form the special Working Group from representatives of respective Ministries and Agencies of two countries.

Within **Components 1 and 2** the project supports holding of meetings of CTWC, its Secretariat and Working Groups related to SAP development as well as ensures completion of the development of CTWC web-site in accordance with GEF IW: LEARN Guidelines.

The **Component 3** of the project is targeted on capacity building on water quality and quantity monitoring and programming of water quality improvement in two basins. Within this component one direct contract with Kazhydromet and one Letter of Agreement with Kyrgyzhydromet were agreed and implemented for assessment of water quality in Chu and talas River Basins.

## Project Summary Table

<b>Project Title:</b>	Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	UNDP
<b>Business Unit:</b>	KGZ10
<b>PAC Meeting Date:</b>	10 Nov 2014
<b>Award ID:</b>	00081980
<b>Atlas Project ID:</b>	00091092
<b>PIMS number:</b>	5167
<b>Start Date:</b>	September 2014
<b>End Date:</b>	September 2017
<b>Management Arrangement:</b>	DIM <sup>3</sup>
<b>Total allocated resources (US\$):</b>	<b>\$7,239,397.04</b>
<b>GEF</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
<b>Co-financing:</b>	
Shared Waters Partnership (cash)	\$65,427.04
Government of Kazakhstan	\$750,000
Government of Kyrgyzstan	\$1,170,000
Swiss Development Cooperation (cash in-parallel)	\$2,200,000
Government of Finland (in-kind)	\$1,313,970
UNECE (cash and in-kind)	\$440,000
UNDP (in-kind)	\$300,000

## DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks

The MTR team will consist of an independent consultant that will conduct the MTR - 1 international evaluator and supported with an Interpreter (Russian-English-Russian). The consultant shall have a prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Consultant will bear responsibility over submission of a final report. The selected evaluator should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

<sup>3</sup> According to DIM Authorization for Kyrgyzstan Country Programme 2012-2016, Kori Udovički, Regional Director, dd. 11 January 2012.

The MTR consultant will first conduct a desk review of the project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, AWP, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Board meetings' minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference. Then they will participate in an MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to following:

- UNDP Senior Management;
- The Chu-Talas Water Commission (CTWC) Co-Chairs from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and the Secretariat
- The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic – GEF Operational Focal Point;
- Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan - GEF Operational Focal Point
- Kazhydromet
- Kyrgyzhydromet
- Chu-Talas Basin Authorities in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan
- UNDP “Sustainable Development” Dimension and its projects;
- UNDP Kazakhstan project coordinator;
- NGOs;
- UNECE Regional Adviser on Environment
- GEF RC in UNDP IRH

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects](#) for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

## **1. Project Strategy**

### *Project Design:*

- 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.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities
- Review decision-making processes

### *Results Framework/Logframe:*

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

## 2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

## 3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Using the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; assess the following categories of project progress:

- Management Arrangements
- Work Planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

## 4. Sustainability

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR consultant will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

### D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 1 week before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: (May 10, 2017)

- Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR field mission. Approximate due date: (May 20, 2017)
- Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 2 weeks of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (June 5, 2017)
- Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: (June 25, 2017)

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

### **E. Institutional Arrangement**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant, and ensure the timely provision of due payments and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The Certifying Officer of this assignment is Sustainable Development Dimension Chief.

### **F. Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 effective person-days over a period of 10 weeks starting *March 20, 2017*. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- 3 days: Desk review and preparing MTR Inception Report;
- 2 days: Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission;
- 8 days: MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (including Mission wrapup meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission);
- 7 days: Preparing draft report;
- 2 days: Incorporating audit trail on draft report;
- 3 days: Finalization of MTR report/Expected full MTR completion.

The start date of the contract is planned for May 3, 2017.

### **G. Duty Station**

#### **Travel:**

- One international travel for 8 effective person-days of field mission to Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, Astana and Taraz, Kazakhstan will be required during the MTR mission;
- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;  Statement of Medical Fitness for Work:

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 62 years of age are required, at their own cost, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from an UN - approved doctor prior to taking up their assignment. Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

- Inoculations/Vaccinations

Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP;

- Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>.
- The Individual Consultant must obtain security clearance before travelling to the duty station;
- All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to duty station. UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket and daily allowance exceeding UNDP rates. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

## REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

### H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

Qualifications
Master degree in the field of natural sciences or environmental or water resources management
Minimum 5 years of professional experience in the fields of environmental or water resources management
Proven track record of evaluation of projects focusing on international waters confirmed with at least two project evaluations
At least one project evaluation with GEF M&E policies and procedures
Knowledge of priorities and principles of international waters, confirmed with at least two projects
Excellent English communication skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset

#### **Consultant Independence:**

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

## APPLICATION PROCESS

### I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

#### **Financial Proposal:**

- Financial proposals must be "all inclusive" and expressed in a lump sum for the total duration of the contract. The term "all inclusive" implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);

- Individual on this contract is not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

#### **Schedule of Payments:**

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 2 installments, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final MTR Report.

**June 5, 2017** - 40% upon submission of the draft MTR Report;

**June 25, 2017** - 60% upon finalization of the MTR Report.

#### **J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

- Completed Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Personal CV or a [P11 Personal History form](#)**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate;
- Copy of **ID card**;
- Copy of **diploma**;
- Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Documents with a subject "International Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation" should be submitted no later than **15:00 (Bishkek time, GMT+6), 27 April 2017** to email: [procurement@undp.kg](mailto:procurement@undp.kg) or by post to the address below: United Nations Development Programme, 160, Chuy Avenue, Bishkek, 720040, Kyrgyz Republic

Receipt of bids will be made only during working hours from 09.00 – 17.00PM

#### **K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

Lowest price among technically compliant candidates.

## Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix

### UNDP/GEF Chu – Talas IWRM project - draft Evaluation Matrix

Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To What extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the GEF IW Focal Area?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of clear relationship between the project objective and GEF IW Focal Area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>GEF IW strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doc analysis</li> <li>Interviews with PCU / UNDP</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the countries?</li> <li>Is the project 'country driven'?</li> <li>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>Degree of coherence between project and national priorities etc.</li> <li>Appreciation from national stakeholders to project design and implementation</li> <li>Level of government involvement in the design of project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>National Policies, priorities and strategies</li> <li>Project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP</li> <li>Interviews with project partners and national stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?</li> <li>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Donor representatives and documents</li> <li>ProDoc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul>

Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</li> <li>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</li> </ul>			
<b>Progress towards results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What level progress has been made on outputs and outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>%age delivery of outputs presented in the project results framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PIRs</li> <li>PCU/UNDP CO</li> <li>Stakeholder interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of indicators/targets from results framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>Examples of supported partnerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> <li>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</li> <li>Was there an effective collaboration between</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</li> <li>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
<p>institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> <li>• What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</li> <li>• Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>• Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>• Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• PCU, UNDP CO/RTA</li> <li>• Stakeholders</li> <li>• PIR/APR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with project, EA and IA staff</li> <li>• Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>• Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>• Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</li> <li>• Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>• Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>• Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>• Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>• Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>• Timeliness of procurement/recruitment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP CO</li> <li>• PCU</li> <li>• UNDP RTA</li> <li>• Minutes from PSC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with UNDP CO/RTA and PCU</li> </ul>

Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>• Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>			
<b>Sustainability: To What extent are there financial, institution, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What factors have been assessed with respect to the long-term operation of the Commission?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents indicating consideration of sustainability of Commission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports and other outputs</li> <li>• PSC minutes</li> <li>• Commission documents</li> <li>• Stakeholders</li> <li>• PIRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with stakeholders, project staff</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What examples can be provided where institutional and socio-economic sustainability of actions has been encouraged?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents indicating consideration of sustainability issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports and other outputs</li> <li>• PSC minutes</li> <li>• Stakeholders</li> <li>• PIRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with stakeholders, project staff</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the project assisting with financial sustainability of the project's actions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National agreements demonstrating financial commitments to IWRM</li> <li>• Anticipated support for SAP (and SAP implementation from national stakeholders)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have environmental issues (e.g. CC) been considered in TDA/IWRM?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporation of CC scenarios in TDA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TDA</li> <li>• Stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

## Annex 3 - Stakeholder interview guide

*To be adapted to the specific person being interviewed to reflect their role in the project*

1. Name:
2. Organisation
3. Role/relationship to the Project
  
4. How has the work of the project been relevant to your country/organisation?
5. What is your perception of the interaction of the project with local/national/regional stakeholders? Were their needs met?
6. How has the project interacted with other environmental actions in the Chu – Talas River Basins?
7. In your view, what have been the main achievements and lessons (positive and negative) of the project?
  
8. Do you think that the project has been effective in delivering the outputs you expected from this GEF actions? What has been the most and least effective from your perspective?
9. Have the voices of stakeholders been effectively heard by the project?
10. Do you think that the project could have delivered more and if so what extra could have been achieved?
11. Did the project effectively communicate what it was doing and its achievements?
  
12. From your perspective, has the project been efficiently managed?
13. Did you receive any expected reports on the progress of the project? Were these provided on-time?
14. Did partnerships/linkages to institutions and government (national and local) deliver good collaboration? What was good/less good in the collaboration?
15. Was there a balance between the use of international and national expertise?
16. Were the international and national/local organisations responsible for executing the project efficient at delivering the planned activities?
17. What are the remaining challenges for the SAP implementation – and how will these be overcome?
18. How will the activities of the project be supported post-project?

## Annex 4 - MTR Ratings

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results:</b> (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management:</b> (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
---	----------------------------	--

**Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating)

4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

## Annex 5 - Mission Agenda

### Mid-Term Review of the GEF Project “Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in Chu and Talas River Basins” Dr. Peter Whalley, (accompanying interpreter is Mrs. Ilyasova Gulsara)

May 28 – June 6, 2017

Day and timing	Meeting, activity	Place and Venue
May 28, 2017		
Morning	Arrival to Bishkek	Accommodation in Urmat Ordo Hotel ( <a href="http://www.urmatordo.kg/">http://www.urmatordo.kg/</a> ), Bishkek
May 29, 2017		
Morning 10:30-11:30	Briefing with Senior Management of UNDP CO Participants: Ms. Nikulita Aliona, UNDP DRR Mr. Kasybekov Erkinbek, UNDP ARR Mr. Ibragimov Daniar, UNDP Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction Team Leader Ms. Nurzhanova Sherbet, UNDP Programme Associate Ms. Moldokulova Zhyldyz, Manager of UNDP Programme Management Unit	UNDP CO, Bishkek
Afternoon 13:30-14:45	Meeting with Project Team Participants: Mr. Kylychev Kumar, UNDP PMU SD Dimension Chief Mr. Makeev Talaibek, Project Coordinator Ms. Damirbek kyzy Eliza	UNDP PMU Office , Bishkek
15:00-16:00	Security briefing with UNDSS	UNDP CO, Bishkek
May 30, 2017		
Morning 9:30 – 10:30	<b>Meeting with Mr. Rustamov Abdykalyk, GEF OFP, Director of the State Agency on Environment and Forestry (SAEPF)</b> Participants: Mr. Mamatairov Bekbolot, Head of Environmental Monitoring Department Ms. Salykmambetova Baglan, Head of International Department	SAEPF Office in Bishkek
11:00-12:00	Meeting with Mr. Itibaev Zarylbek, Director of KyrgyzHydromet Participants: Ms. Nishanbayeva Ludmila, Head of the Department on Monitoring of Environmental Pollutions Ms. Zhunusheva Gulnara, Head of Hydrology Section	Kyrgyzhydromet Office in Bishkek
Afternoon 14:00-15:00	<b>Meeting with Mr. Koilubaev Bakir, Co-Chair of CTWC from Kyrgyzstan, Deputy Director General of Department of Water Resources of the Ministry of Agriculture</b> Participants:	DWR Office, Bishkek

16:00-17:00	Ms. Satymkulova Gulmira, Head of CTWC Secretariat Devjatkulov Ruslan, Head of Chu Province Water Department	
	<b>Meeting with Ms. Satymkulova Gulmira, Head of CTWC Secretariat</b> Participants: Urustomov Ulanbek, Deputy Head of CTWC Secretariat	Chu Province Water Department, Bishkek
May 31, 2017		
Morning	Travel to Taraz	
Afternoon 14:00-15:00	<b>Meeting with Ms. Akbozova Inidira, Head of CTWC Secretariat (Kazakhstan)</b>	Office of Chu-Talas Basin Inspection
15:30-16:30	<b>Meeting with Mr. Muhatov Zhumabek, Head of Chu-Talas Basin Inspection</b> Participants: Ms. Akbozova Inidira, Head of CTWC Secretariat Mr. Kuralbaev Galymbek, Deputy Head of Chu-Talas Basin Inspection	Office of Chu-Talas Basin Inspection
June 1, 2017		
Morning 9:00-10:30	<b>Meeting with Mr. Alimzhanov Anuar, Head of Kazhydromet Branch in Dzhambul Province</b> Participants: Ms. Bepalova Raisa	Kazhyrdomet Office , Taraz
11:00 – 12:00	<b>Meeting with NGOs</b> Participants: Mr. Sabitov Rauf. Chair of the Aksuu-Jabagly – Manas Club Ms. Efimova Elena. Aksuu-Jabagly –Manas Club,	Kazhyrdomet Office , Taraz
Afternoon 16:40	Flight Taraz – Astana	
June 2, 2017		
Morning 9:00-10:00	<b>Courtesy meeting with UNDP Kazakhstan Senior Management</b> Participants: Ms. Baigazina Victoria, UNDP Kazakhstan, Programme Associate Mr. Zhumabaev Yerlan, Project Coordinator, UNDP Kazakhstan <b>Meeting with Mr. Zhumabaev Yerlan, Project Coordinator, UNDP Kazakhstan</b> Participants: Mr. Firuz Ibrohimov, CTA	UNDP Kazakhstan
11:00-12:00	<b>Meeting with the representative of GEF OFP in the Ministry of Energy of republic of Kazakhstan</b> Participants: Mr. Torobekov Talgat, Head of the Department of Environmental Regulation	Ministry of Energy

Afternoon 15:00-16:00	<b>Meeting with Mr. Nisanbaev Erlan, Representative of the Co-Chair of CTWC Vice Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan</b> Participants: Mr. Zhienbaev Muslim, Head of Transboundary Rivers Section Mr Arystanov Meiram, Leading Expert of Transboundary Rivers Section	Ministry of Agriculture
June 3, 2017		
Afternoon	Flight Astana – Bishkek	Air Astana KC 151 at 15:15
June 5, 2017		
Morning 10:00-11:00	<b>Debriefing meeting with UNDP Senior Management, followed by a presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations</b> Participants: Ms. Shishkaraeva Elmira, Gender Team Ms. Arstanbekova, Aidai, M&E Ms. Moldokulova Jyldyz, PMU Manager	UNDP CO, Bishkek
Afternoon 13:30-15:00	Meeting with Project Team	UNDP PMU Office, Bishkek
June 6, 2017	Flight Bishkek – Istanbul	Airport transfer from the Hotel

## Annex 6 - Stakeholders involved in MTR

Inidira	Akbozova	Head of CTWC Secretariat (KZ)
Anuar	Alimzhanov	Head of Kazhydromet Branch in Dzhambul Province (KZ)
Aidai	Arstanbekova	M&E, UNDP (KG)
Meiram	Arystanov	Leading Expert of Transboundary Rivers Section, Ministry of Agriculture (KZ)
Raisa	Bespalova	Kazhydromet, Traz (KZ)
Martin	Bloxham	SAP, Consultant
Eliza	Damirbek	Project Assistant (KG)
Elena	Efimova	Aksuu-Jabagly –Manas Club (NGO – KZ)
Firuz	Ibrohimov	CTA, UNDP (KZ)
Zarylbek	Itibaev	Director of KyrgyzHydromet (KG)
Erkinbek	Kasybekov	UNDP ARR (KG)
Kumar	Kylychev	UNDP PMU SD Dimension Chief (KG)
Bo	Libert	UNECE
Talaibek	Makeev	Project Coordinator (KG)
Vladimir	Mamaev	RTA, UNDP-GEF, IRH
Bekbolot	Mamatairov	Head of Environmental Monitoring Department State Agency on Environment and Forestry (SAEPF) (KG)
Bakyt	Makhmutov	Swiss Development Co-operation (SDC), Bishkek
Mary	Matthews	TDA Consultant
Jyldyz	Moldokulova	UNDP Programme Management Unit (KG)
Zhumabek	Muhatov	Head of Chu-Talas Basin Inspection (KZ)
Aliona	Nikulita	UNDP DRR (Kyrgyzstan)
Erlan	Nisanbaev	Representative of the Co-Chair of CTWC Vice Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan
Ludmila,	Nishanbayeva	Head of the Department on Monitoring of Environmental Pollutions, KyrgyzHydromet (KG)
Sherbet	Nurzhanova	UNDP Programme Associate (KG)
Abdykalyk	Rustamov	GEF OFP, Director of the State Agency on Environment and Forestry (SAEPF) (KG)
Rauf	Sabitov	Chair of the Aksuu-Jabagly –Manas Club (NGO – KZ)
Baglan	Salykmambetova	State Agency on Environment and Forestry (SAEPF) (KG)
Gulmira	Satymkulova	Head of CTWC Secretariat, Department of Water Resources of the Ministry of Agriculture (KG)
Elmira	Shishkaraeva	Gender Team, UNDP PMU (KG)
Aikura	Toktonelieva	Chief Specialist, Water Resources Unit, Department of Water Resources of the Ministry of Agriculture (KG)
Talgat	Torobekov	Head of the Department of Environmental Regulation, Ministry of Energy (KZ)
Ulanbek,	Urustomov	Deputy Head of CTWC Secretariat, Department of Water Resources of the Ministry of Agriculture (KG)
Muslim	Zhienbaev	Head of Transboundary Rivers Section, Ministry of Agriculture (KZ)
Yerlan	Zhumabaev	Project Coordinator, UNDP (KZ)

## Annex 7: Documents Reviewed

The key documents referred to include:

1. PIF
2. UNDP Project Document
3. Project Inception Report
4. PIRs (2016)
5. AWP
6. Draft TDA
7. UNDP Joint Work Plan on Gender Mainstreaming in 2017 (Chu-Talas Project)
8. Minutes of Project Board
9. UNDP Guidelines for MTRs

## Annex 8: MTR's assessment of progress on Outcomes/Outputs

Green = Achieved (>80%)    Yellow = on Target    Red = Not on target

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)	Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)	MTR assessment
<b>Objective:</b> Strengthening transboundary cooperation and promoting integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins, and empowering the Water Commission of Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic	Science based consensus on major transboundary environmental concerns and possible solutions (TDA), leading to agreement between the two countries on a joint program of corrective actions (SAP) and on harmonized monitoring and data exchange protocols.  The Water Commission strengthened through	Currently, transboundary cooperation in the Chu-Talas basins is mainly limited to the implementation of the existing water sharing agreement and does not include consideration of ecosystem integrity and environmental sustainability in view of climatic variability and change.  Deteriorated monitoring networks hinder ability of the	At the end of project:  SAP endorsed by countries at Ministerial level. (15%)  Governments approve expanded mandate of the Water Commission and establish Environmental Expert Group. (10%)  Water quantity and quality monitoring procedures harmonized (40%)		The project is on target to deliver the TDA and the technically approved (by the CTWC) SAP. The CTWC, their secretariat and the WGs are benefit from training and practical engagements (in the TDA/SAP) that is expected to strengthen their capacity on water and environment management.

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)	Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)	MTR assessment
	improved water monitoring ability, and its mandate expanded to include environmental aspects	Commission to implement the water sharing agreement.			
<b>Component 1: Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analysis to inform adaptive management of the Chu – Talas shared water resources</b>					
<i>Outcome 1: Science based consensus among the countries on major transboundary problems of the basin</i>	The TDA of the Chu and Talas Basins prepared jointly by the two countries, identifying issues of transboundary concern.	At the moment there is not common understanding over transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins among the stakeholders in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan	TDA completed and approved by first semester of Year 2	1.1 TDA (90%)	Still to be published, but technically approved by CTWC
<i>Outcome 2: Improved understanding of the transboundary implications of the shared nature of the Basins' water resources</i>					
<i>Outcome 3: Improved knowledge of the consequences of extreme weather situations</i>	Considerations based on Water Scenarios, on climate variability and change and surface-groundwater	Currently there is no common understanding of possible future water resources scenarios in the basin. This hinders the decision making	TDA document including consideration of future water scenarios and	1.2 Scenarios for water futures (80%)	Links closely with the UNECE work on climate change

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)	Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)	MTR assessment
	interactions included into the TDA.	process on adaptation measures.	surface-groundwater interactions <sup>4</sup> .		
<i>Outcome 4:</i> Capacitated local stakeholders ready to minimize negative consequences for economic sectors as well as the environment in the basin	Program for seminars on climate change adaptation and integrated water resources management approved by the Commission and implemented.	Currently, local governments and others stakeholders in both basins are not prepared to adequately respond to the possible social, economic and environmental implications and risks associated with the transboundary nature of the water resources of the basins and with increased climate variability and change.	Seminars developed and held within first semester of Year 2 of the project implementation.	1.3 Seminars delivered on climate change adaptation (10%)	A local company has just been contracted but the meetings have yet to be organised (linked with other awareness raising meetings – below)
<b>Component 2: Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water co-operation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP)</b>					
<i>Outcome 5:</i> Visioning process and agreement on priorities for action opens the way for	The Strategic Action Program (SAP), with a 5 years horizon and	There is currently no detailed joint integrated program to address	SAP endorsed at Ministerial level by the end of project	2.1 SAP (15%)	The approach is expected to be approved by the CTWC meeting in June 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Groundwater issues were deleted from the project during the inception meeting. However, the project results framework and the PIRs still include the original wording reproduced here

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)</b>	<b>Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)</b>	<b>MTR assessment</b>
systematic cooperation in the integrated management of the transboundary Chu Talas River Basins.	reflecting inter-sectoral dialogue and stakeholder involvement and addressing the major issues of transboundary concern agreed upon by the two countries.	major transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins, and stakeholders have little participation in discussions and decision-making.			<p>The Working Group has been established and two national and one regional meeting convened on the vision.</p> <p>The MTR considers that the technical approval (by CTWC) will be achieved during the project. However the 'ministerial approval' is beyond the control of the project and likely to be following the end of the project</p>
<i>Outcome 6:</i> Strengthened collaborative mechanism for bilateral cooperation framework or the further improvement of joint management	Amendment to the Commission regulations establishing a clear environmental mandate, and a joint Environmental Expert Group.	Currently, the functions and competencies of the Chu-Talas Commission are limited to joint water management (quantity) coordination in the two basins.	Amendment to the Statutes of the Commission/Secretariat adopted by governments by end of Year 1.	2.4 Revised statutes (15%)	This activity is also to consider 'incorporating' the commission/secretariat by creating a legal entity. Two lawyers have been recruited to

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)	Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)	MTR assessment
of the Chu and Talas basins.					review mechanism and suggest approach
<i>Outcome 7:</i> Steps taken for the involvement of stakeholders in the decision making process	?			2.2 IMC  2.3 Stakeholder involvement (50 %)	(Indicators, baseline and target not included in the results framework). These tasks are included in an IAA with UNECE as part of their National Policy Dialogues.  Two NGOs from each country are involved and participate in the PB (and NCOs are invited to other project activities)
<i>Outcome 8:</i> Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally	Twinning and experience exchanges with other transboundary basins, dissemination of project results and participation to IW LEARN activities	No ongoing or previous outreach, dissemination and awareness raising activities related to the two basins management.	Twinning with at least another river basin showing similar characteristics and problems, and communication platform (website) established during the early project phases	2.5 Twinning  2.6 IWL compatible web	A study tour to the Sava Commission has been completed and further involvement of the Sava commission is planned  A project website (as a component of a new

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)	Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)	MTR assessment
				(25%)	CTWC web) is expected to be operational (Russian/English) in August. The lack of a website is highlighted by this MTR and is an issue that is hampering wider stakeholder involvement and awareness
<b>Component 3: Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins</b>					
<i>Outcome 9:</i> Improved basis for the dialogue on transboundary water management on the basis of a better understanding of the quantity and quality of water resources, and their variability in the two basins.	Report containing the assessment of present situation of surface and groundwater quantity and quality monitoring including redommendations for an harmonized system completed.	Currently latent conflict situations between Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan exist in regulation of water resources distribution and allocation, and pollution in both basins due to differences in technologies and procedures for monitoring the quantity	Assessment Report completed and approved by the Commission and by national agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, by the end of Year 2.	3.1 Assessment of surface and groundwater <sup>5</sup> quantity/quality (60%)	The results framework has to be modified to reflect the deletion of GWs agreed in the inception meeting. Editing groups have been established to finalise the reports

<sup>5</sup> Groundwater issues were deleted from the project during the inception meeting. However, the project results framework and the PIRs still include the original wording reproduced here

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)</b>	<b>Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)</b>	<b>MTR assessment</b>
		and quality of water resources.			
<i>Outcome 10: Countries capacity built for improved coordinated monitoring</i>	Reports containing (i) the assessment of capacity building needs in water resources monitoring; (ii) a program for ad hoc training of staff of the two countries; (iii) the results of the capacity building activities and events, including number of participants and results assessment	Currently, water monitoring is poor and sporadic based on limited number of observations and indicators. Staff has no capacity to use new monitoring technologies.	Reports on needs assessment and on implementation and results of training program prepared by the end of the project.	3.2 Water Quality training (15%)	Local organisation has been recruited to implement the logistics associated with the training and the substantive elements will be provided by the Sava commission. The twinning actions (described above) have The project has agreed 7 areas for co-operation with the Sava Commission and will include the sharing of best practices in regional water management within the Commission
<i>Outcome 11: Consensus on joint monitoring activities between the two countries.</i>	Formal agreement on harmonized monitoring and data exchange protocols in the two basins.	No approved rules for transboundary water quality monitoring and information exchange exist	Agreement between the two countries formalized by project completion.	3.4 Agreement on co-ordinated monitoring and data exchange (10%)	This work is included in the AWP (2017) (data exchange policy). Substantive work on this has yet to begin.

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project target (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of objective / outcome as of June 17)</b>	<b>Main outputs (Regional Co-ordinator's estimates of delivery of outputs as of June 17)</b>	<b>MTR assessment</b>
					The MTR considers that this target (final agreement) may be achieved beyond the time limits of the project (see section XX). However the technical agreement of the CTWC is likely under this project.

## Annex 9: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation /Mid-term Review Consultants

### ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants<sup>1</sup>

#### Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

#### MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: PETER WHALLEY

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): —

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

Signed at Malmosbury, UK (Place) on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017 (Date)

Signature: Peter Whalley