

**HKKH PARTNERSHIP PROJECT
Nepal, Pakistan, China**

**EXTERNAL MID-TERM REVIEW
Annexes**

**Prepared by
Elena Laura Ferretti – Team Leader/Institutional Expert
Giancarlo Carrai, Information System Expert**

April, 25th, 2008

Annex 1 - TORs

THE PROPOSAL

This proposal seeks the services to carry out an external mid-term review of the HKKH Project concerning its performance and its institutional and organizational aspects. The review will help to guide decisions regarding the final phases of the project and recommend beneficial areas for on-going work.

To maximise the effectiveness of final monitoring and evaluation activities, the evaluator will spend adequate time to become familiar with the nature of the project, its background and institutional arrangements among the four implementing organizations and the donor (DGCS, Italy).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

HKKH partnership background

The regional Project “Institutional Consolidation for the Coordinated and Integrated Monitoring of Natural Resources towards Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation in the Hindu Kush-Karakoram-Himalaya Mountain Complex” is a partnership initiative developed in the framework of the priorities defined in the WSSD Draft Plan of Implementation and considering the recommendations made for achieving successful implementation of the priorities identified in Agenda 21.

The Project is financed by the Italian Cooperation DGCS. The implementing organization is IUCN through its Asia Regional Office (IUCN-ARO). The Executing Agencies are the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), Ev-K2-CNR, CESVI - Cooperazione e Sviluppo and IUCN.

HKKH partnership mandate and role

The project aims at consolidation of institutional capacity for systemic planning and management at the local, national and regional levels and focuses on poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation in the Hindu Kush - Karakoram – Himalaya (HKKH) region. The activities are focused on three national parks: Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) in Nepal, Central Karakoram National Park (CKNP) in Pakistan and Quomolongma Nature Preserve (QNP) in Tibet Autonomous Region (TAR) of PR China.

Governance and stakeholders in the frame of the HKKH partnership

The project document established a governance scheme to regulate relation among implementing partners, effective execution and implementation of activities and stakeholders involvement and ownership. The project is organised as follows:

- One implementing agency (IUCN)
- Four executing organizations (CESVI, EVK2CNR, ICIMOD, IUCN)
- One Executing Committee including two representatives each of all four implementing organizations
- One Stakeholder Partnership including relevant stakeholders and interested institutions
- One CTA to overview overall technical guidance, management and implementation of activities
- One PMU to take care of activities and to provide support, coordination and infrastructure to project activities
- One Technical Team to be responsible for technical issues within the project with one representative from all implementing organisations

Implementation of activities

Activities are implemented with reference to a General Operational Plan (GOP) for the three-year project period approved by the donor.

Detailed Operational Plans (DOP) are prepared every semester to specify and detail activities on a six monthly time frame. Each of the DOP progress reports, plans and budgets are reviewed by the donor for approval.

Each implementing partner submits to PMU a six month plan to be included in the overall DOP to be approved by the donor. According to approved activities partners deliver activities within the semester according to an agreed schedule. Funds are disbursed accordingly.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose of the evaluation

The Executing Committee held in Bergamo in July 2007 expressed concerns that the project has arrived at a critical moment of implementation and to better steer and orientate activities for the future some form of evaluation should be carried out to strengthen its different implementation and governance structures. This was further reinforced at the Executing Committee meeting held in Kathmandu, February 2008 which determined that the review is an appropriate mechanism to ensure the final phases of the project are as effective as possible. As the project is now undertaking activities in the fourth DOP, and with 15 months of the project implementation to go, the partners agree that a review of the project is timely.

The Donor has also expressed interest in carrying out an evaluation on activities implemented so far provided the evaluation adds value and is future oriented. The occasion of having an external evaluation promoted by the Donor to overview project activities should be used as an opportunity to look from a wider perspective of the overall project.

The Executing Committee decided to promote an evaluation covering the overall project and partner's performance as well as the organizational modalities adopted to govern the project. Given the partnership includes complex mechanisms where four different institutions are operating in implementing a regional programme with challenging objectives, an evaluation of the partner's performance, organizational aspects and institutional arrangements is considered important to help steer the Project adequately and to move smoothly towards the final phase of the work.

Specifically the evaluation aims to be consistent with the project's anticipated results and will identify areas of improvement in its implementation, partner's performance, management, governance and engagement with stakeholders to increase the sense of ownership among involved institutions and beneficiaries. Moreover the evaluation will recommend on:

- Any minor 'course changes' with respect to the direction of the project and its deliverables;
- Areas of particular focus in the final phases of the project based on where the project is having greatest impact and value;
- Strengths and shortcomings in project design and evolution; and
- Areas of activity which have proven to be of greatest value and which should be emphasized in any future phases of the project.

This implies that the evaluation should not focus only on what has been achieved so far but also assess the prospects of the project to achieve in the medium term

In summary the Evaluation Report should provide the Executing Committee with an assessment of how the partnership is operating; what are the key constraints; where emphasis should be placed in the final phases; and some scenarios for future direction.

Key evaluation questions

The key evaluation aspects to be addressed are:

1. Rationale of the revised strategic and methodological approaches of the Project (revised from the original project document) and its effects on stakeholder acceptance, and its medium and long-term prospects
2. Project Performance:
 - a. Progress registered during the first half of the Project
 - b. Partners performance in delivering outputs
 - c. Effectiveness of the Project Management systems
3. Project Governance mechanisms
4. Project relevance, sustainability and possibility to develop a second phase
5. Partners expectations about the partnership beyond the current Project and or current phase
6. Understanding where the project has added most value and how this can be optimized in any future phases of the work.

Activities

1. The Consultant will prepare a simple evaluation plan to operationalize the evaluation
2. The evaluation plan should clearly describe how the evaluation will be carried out. It is important that the evaluation plan complies with the given TOR, but the Consultant(s) should also suggest any refinements to improve the benefits of the evaluation.
3. The evaluation plan will have to be endorsed by the Executing Committee and will be transmitted to the Donor.

Evaluation Methods and Scope of Work

The evaluator is expected to undertake the evaluation in as rigorous manner as possible to produce information and make recommendations that are sufficiently valid and reliable based on data and analysis. It is expected that the evaluator will conduct a participatory evaluation that will involve project implementers and target beneficiaries in all key evaluation tasks. Existing project documents and progress reports will be shared with the evaluator to facilitate completion of the tasks. As far as possible, physical meetings will be held with stakeholders and if this is not feasible, telephonic interviews will be conducted.

DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

The evaluation will have a total duration of 25 working days including travel and will be carried out by a team of 2 experts.

The consultants will work closely with project staff, implementing institutions and the PMU.

Complete Draft report

This report will describe the evaluation process and the evaluator's findings, assessment and recommendations. The presentation of results is to be intrinsically linked to the evaluation issues, logically flowing from the information collected. The report must include an Executive Summary.

The Draft Report will be circulated to the partnership members and PMU for factual verification.

Final output report

The final report of the consultancy will follow the same structure outlined in the intermediate report, and will include all factual amendments provided by the partner organizations and the PMU, plus the consequential evaluative adjustments that may be necessary.

The Final Report will be submitted simultaneously to the Members of the Executing Committee and the PMU.

Final and intermediate reports shall be in English. All communication, e-mail, letters and material shall be in English.

Timing and duration

The timing of the evaluation must ensure that the draft outputs will be available for the next Executing Committee scheduled for the beginning of July 2008. The following schedule indicates the latest dates for which the outputs will have to be delivered. The final schedule will depend on the actual availability of the consultant(s).

Submission of Evaluation methodology	April 18 th , 2008
Start of evaluation activities	As soon as possible, but not later than May 3 rd , 2008
First Draft Report	May 30 th , 2008
Comments from Executing Committee	June 6 th 2008
Final Report	not later than June 15 th 2008

The mission will include travel Nepal and Pakistan as well as to Italy for meetings with the donor and partners based there.

All of the outputs of the consultancy belong to the Donor and the HKKH partnership.

Payments will be product based, and they will be conditional on approval of the products agreed upon in the evaluation plan in a timely manner. Failure to meet the deadlines may result in reduction of payment.

Logistical arrangements

The Consultant(s) will use PMU facilities and logistics (office space, administrative and secretarial support, transport, telecommunications, printing of documentation, etc.)

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CONSULTANT(S)

The review will be undertaken by a team of consultants with a relevant degree and appropriate experience on evaluation and organizational / institutional evaluations or assessments. The ideal team will have experience working with cooperation projects with regional scale; previous working experience in Asia and in the countries where the project is operated is preferential. The consultants must be able to speak and write in English.

Desirable attributes include a knowledge of protected area management & practice and experience with DGCS as a donor.

Annex 2

Evaluation Plan

1. Background

This Evaluation Plan follows the general ToRs prepared by the Project and is an integral part of it; therefore its content is not repeated here but integrated by an explanation of how the Mid-Term Review will be conducted.

The Evaluation Team is composed of two persons: the Team Leader, focussing on institutional and planning aspects and the Information System expert, focussing on technical and planning aspects; however the two experts will collaborate on all parts of the review.

The Evaluation Team is requested to cover aspects related to the project technical performance and the institutional and organizational set up in order to make recommendations, guide the final phases of the project and focus on selected priorities.

The objective of the MTR is to assess the project design and implementation, make recommendations and propose eventual corrective measures. This will be done in accordance to the criteria listed below, each one associated with a number of evaluation questions. The Evaluation is focused on technical aspects; there will be a general assessment of the coherence of costs as associated with activities but the review is not required to go into budget and costs details.

2. Criteria and Evaluation questions

Following a careful revision of the project documents and although additional elements can be added during the development of the mission, the following key evaluation questions are proposed with relation to:

Relevance: it relates primarily to the project design and concerns the extent to which its stated objectives correctly address identified problems and real needs at two milestones of the project life span: when the project was designed and at the time of monitoring.

Specifically:

- Is the project relevant with relation to local, national, regional (Nepal, Tibet/China, Pakistan) needs for managing protected areas and was it identified with the participation of intended beneficiaries?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the overall design and Logical Framework: i) clarity and consistency of the goal and the specific objective, ii) appropriateness of the selection of the OVI and level of agreement on them iii) appropriateness of the identification of risks and assumptions?
- What is the rationale of the revised strategic and methodological approaches of the Project (revised from the original project document) and its effects on stakeholder acceptance, and its medium and long-term prospects?
- Have the partners the necessary experience to develop the proposed activities and have they developed a common vision towards expected impact?
- Has the stakeholders' analysis captured all internal and external actors' needs and requirements?
- Are Information Technologies tools adequate to the local common understanding and fitting (well dimensioned) to the context?

Effectiveness: to assess the quality of the planning (in particular the Logical Framework), the degree to which the specific objectives of the project are being achieved and if the beneficiaries really benefited from the products or services which are being created. Specifically:

- Assess the quality of the Logical Framework and of the planning tools, indicators or benchmarks (as detailed in the project Logical Framework) with relation to the specific objectives
- Assess if planned benefits are being delivered, as perceived by the beneficiaries
- Assess if behavioural patterns have changed in the beneficiary organisations or groups
- Assess the level of coherence, integration and cooperation among the implementing partners

- Assess the level of coherence, integration and cooperation within the extended network of partners
- Determine any constraint to the achievement of the project objectives specifically in relation to monitoring and indicators and benchmarks
- Assess if management was adaptive that is if management of risk was adequate and if management responded adequately to changes in circumstances

Efficiency: to assess the quality of the planning tools (in particular the Logical Framework) and the degree to which activities transformed available resources (inputs) into intended results (or outputs and, if identified, outcomes) in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. A general idea will be given of value-for-money: that is whether similar results could have been achieved by other means at lower cost in the same time. Specifically:

- Assess the quality of the Logical Framework and planning document against indicators with relation to results
- Assess the quality and timeliness (respect of deadlines) of the outputs produced by the different partners
- Assess the quality of the research to identify data to establish a baseline for environmental and socio-economic monitoring and for running a Decision Support System Toolbox
- Assess the quality of the capacity development implemented activities at the individual, institutional and if relevant at the systemic level (including the quality of the planned and implemented training framework)
- Identify any unexpected output from the project
- Among activities areas currently developed, identify those which have greater chances of transforming into tangible outputs during this project phase and those that could eventually be strengthened in a following phase
- Assess the execution and management of the project to assess levels of efficiency
- Assess the quality of the institutional set up and managing mechanisms as well as linkages among the different established units (IA (IUCN), Executing organizations (CESVI, EVK2CNR, ICIMOD, IUCN), the Executing Committee including two representatives each of all four implementing organizations, the Stakeholder Partnership including relevant stakeholders and interested institutions, the CTA, the PMU, the Technical Team)
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project M&E system

Impact: the assessment of impact relates to the long-term effects of the project and may still be too early to be undertaken. However it may be possible to have a first insight into:

- Effects of the project with relation to research results
- Effects of the project with relation to IT results
- Effects of the project with relation to participatory mechanism

Sustainability: as per impact, it may be too early to assess the sustainability of the services produced beyond the project life. Where possible:

- Identify factors that may influence sustainability in the medium and long term
- Assess the degree of ownership among stakeholders and their participation in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the project
- Assess the commitment of the four implementing partners during and eventually beyond project life
- Assess the project financial, institutional and social sustainability in terms of on-going and future running costs of park management and of managing the Information Systems developed
- Assess the development of local capacities with relation to park management and running, updating and maintaining the Information Systems developed
- Assess the quality of the links established among partners and among stakeholders and the possibilities that these will be maintained and strengthened in the future

3. Performance rating

The Evaluation Team will produce an overall performance rating for each of the above evaluation criteria, in the form of a Summary Table on the basis of the following scale:

- highly satisfactory: fully according to plan or better
- satisfactory: on balance according to plan, positive aspects outweighing negative aspects
- less than satisfactory: not sufficiently according to plan, taking account of the evolving context; a few positive aspects, but outweighed by negative aspects
- highly unsatisfactory: seriously deficient, very few or no positive aspects.

4. Methodology

The Evaluation Team proposes the following methodology to carry out the required activities:

- **Documentation and Literature Review:** it includes among others the Project Proposal, the POG, all Detailed Operational Plans produced, all Progress Reports and other monitoring reports produced, technical material developed for the design of the Decision Support System Toolbox, the Capacity Building Framework, contracts with partners and any other document to be determined during the development of the mission
- **Review of tools and data:** it includes the software developed and data which are being produced
- **Country visits to Nepal and Pakistan:** the project is regional and includes Nepal, Pakistan and Tibet. The activities developed in China are at a very early stage of development for which a visit to Tibet appears not to be a priority. Visits will include discussions with key stakeholders and partners and possibly visits to both the Pakistan and Nepal selected protected area (Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) in Nepal, Central Karakoram National Park (CKNP) in Pakistan).The logistics will be organised by the project staff and the CTA; the Evaluation Team relies on them to indicate the areas and people to visit and meet
- **Interviews with all partners:** interviews will start in Italy with two of the implementing partners: EVK2CNR and CESVI and will be conducted before departure for the field. In mission ICIMOD and IUCN will be interviewed as well. All interviews will be preceded by a telephone briefing with the CTA before departure and will continue during the mission and will include a debriefing after the visits to the protected areas
- **Interviews with the donor:** interviews will be conducted with DGCS in Italy, if available with both the geographical and technical representative for the project
- **Interviews with key stakeholders:** interviews will be conducted with key stakeholders in both Nepal and Pakistan and will include institutional and private organizations as well as affected or beneficiary population.

5. Reporting and Scheduling

The present Evaluation Plan is the first product of the Evaluation Team, which is prepared before departure (within the 25th of April, 2008).

Following the visits and interviews, the Evaluation Team will present the preliminary findings and report (within 7th of June, 2008).

Finally the Evaluation Team will complete the evaluation report by integrating comments by the project to the preliminary report (within the 20th of June, 2008).

Annex 3

Schedule and List of Persons Met

Date	Place	Activity	Institution	Persons met
21 Apr	Bergamo	Meetings with partners based in Italy (CESVI and EV-K2-CNR)	CESVI	Paolo Caroli
			Ev-K2-CNR	Beth Schommer Franco Salerno
29 Apr	Rome	Meeting with DGCS	UTC	Alfredo Guillet
11-12 May		Travel from Italy to Kathmandu		
12 May	Kathmandu, Nepal	Briefing with PMU	PMU	CTA & PMU staff
		Meeting with CG 2 Head	CG 2 Head	Nikhat Sattar
		Briefing with project partners on schedule and methodology	Project partners	Project partners present in KTM
13 May	Kathmandu, Nepal	Meeting with ICIMOD	ICIMOD	Andreas Schild, Basanta Shrestha
		Meeting with DNPWC, SNP and BZ management	Sagarmatha National Park & Buffer Zone (SNPBZ) management	Tulasi Sharma (Chief Warden), Surya Pande (Under Secretary Management Section), Sher Sing Thagunna (Under Secretary Planning section), Tika Ram Adhikavi (Chief Warden), Laxami P. Manandhav (DNPWC Conservation Education Office), Ciopal Prakash (DNPWC Management Office)
14 May	Kathmandu, Nepal	Meeting with Local Researchers	Kathmandu University	Prof Mathema, Prof. Kayastha Prof. Khanal
		Meeting with Local Researchers	Tribhuvan University	Prof P.K. Jha
15 May	Kathmandu, Nepal	Telephone interview	IUCN China	Seth Cook, Wei Juan
		Meeting with Local Researchers	Resources Himalaya	Dr. Dinesh Bhuju (Nepal Academy of Science), Dr. Man Kumar Dhamala (Resources Himalaya Fundation) Satlesh Ranjitkar (Ethnobotanic Society of Nepal)
16 May	Kathmandu, Nepal	Meeting with Local Researchers	Mountain Spirit	Temba Hyolmo
17 May		Travel to Islamabad via Karachi		
18 May	Islamabad, Pakistan	Briefing on HKKH CKNP component	IUCN Pakistan	Sohail Malik, Hamid Sarfraz, Inam Ullah, Sheraz
19 May	Gilgit, Pakistan	Travel ISD-GLT by plane	IUCN Pakistan	Sheraz, Haider Raza, Hamid Sarfraz, Inam Ullah Khan
		Meeting with WWF	WWF	Naseer Ahmed, Muhammad Iqbal, Barkat Ali

	Hunza Karimabad	Field visit to Hunza Valley		
20 May	Gilgit, Pakistan	Meeting with Northern Areas Administration	NAs Administration/ Department of Forest, Wildlife and Parks	Sulaiman Wali (Secretary Forest, Wildlife and Parks), Ghulam Tahir (Conservator of Forests), Mohammed Sharif (Focal Person for CKNP form NAs Administration).
		Meeting with Vice Chancellor, Karakorum International University (KIU)	Karakorum International University	Dr. Aziz Ali Najam
		Meeting with Karakorum Trust	Karakorum Trust	Riaz ul-Hassan, Yasir Abbas
		Meeting with AKRSP	Aga Khan Rural Support Programme	Izhar Ali Hunzai, Amig Beg, Masqud Kan
		Meeting with CESVI representative	CESVI	Daniele Panzeri
		Meeting with IUCN	IUCN	Peter Shadie
21 May	Bagrote	Meeting with Bagrote community		Bagrote community elders
22 May	Gilgit	Workshop		
23 May	Pakistan	Travel to Islamabad-Karachi		
24 May	Pakistan, Nepal	Travel Karachi-Kathmandu		
25 May	Kathmandu, Nepal	Debriefing with PMU		Nikhat Sattar, Emanuele Cuccillato
		Debriefing with all project partners and presentation of main findings		Basanta Shrestha
26 May		Travel to Italy		

Annex 5

List of partners institutions

Level	Partner	Formal collaboration
International	Water Research Institute/ National Research Council (IRSA-CNR)	yes
International	University of Padova, Department of Environmental Medicine and Public Health	yes
International	University of Padova, Department of Agro-Forestry	yes
International	University of Cagliari	yes*
International	IUCN ARO	yes
International	IUCN Nepal	yes
International	IUCN Pakistan	yes
International	IUCN China	yes
International	ICIMOD	yes
International	CESVI	yes
International	Simulistics	yes
International	University of Naples, Faculty of Agriculture	yes*
International	FAO, GLCN Program	
Pakistan	Northern Areas Administration	yes
Pakistan	World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) - Pakistan	yes
Pakistan	The Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP)	yes
Pakistan	Karakorum International University (KIU)	
Pakistan	Karakorum Trust Project	
Nepal	Department of National Park and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC)	yes
Nepal	Tribhuvan University	yes
Nepal	Kathmandu University	yes
Nepal	Resources Himalaya	
Nepal	Sagarmatha Pollution Control Committee (SPCC)	yes
Nepal	Sagarmatha National Park Buffer Zone (SNPBZ)	
Nepal	Sagarmatha National Park (SNP)	yes, though DNPWC
Nepal	Mountain Spirit	yes
Nepal	The mountain institute	yes*
China	Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resource Research/CAS	yes
China	Tibetan Plateau Research Institute/CAS	yes, though IGSNRR