

gaia



*Innovative Solutions
for Sustainability*

Evaluation
Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC)

Report
17.11.2010

Gaia Consulting Oy





Table of Contents

Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Evaluation background and context.....	5
1.2 Evaluation objectives.....	6
1.3 Evaluation approach and methodology	6
1.4 Report structure	8
2. Evaluation findings	9
2.1 Enhancing National Capacity on Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus	9
2.2 Capacity Building for Cooperation on Dam Safety in Central Asia.....	14
2.3 Transboundary cooperation and sustainable management in the Dniester river basin, phase 3	22
2.4 ENVSEC Secretariat.....	28
2.5 Regional Cities and Capacity Building in Tbilisi	30
3. Conclusions and recommendations	32
Annex I. Documents consulted / material reviewed	35
Annex 2. Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.....	38
Annex 3. People consulted (interviewees).....	44
Annex 4. Evaluation criteria and long-list of evaluation questions.....	49
Annex 5. Summary table of the evaluation of the ENVSEC Projects.....	52



Acronyms

ASBP	Aral Sea Basin Programmes
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
DAC	Development Co-operation Directorate
EC	European Commission
ENVSEC	Environment and Security Initiative
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFMC	Global Fire Monitoring Center
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HS	hydraulic structures
IFS	International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
MIA	Ministry for Internal Affairs
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
REC	Regional Environmental Centre
SC	South Caucasus
TAIEX	Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WEI	The Wider Europe Initiative



Executive Summary

Destruction and over-exploitation of natural resources and ecosystems can threaten the security of communities and nations, and good environmental governance and transboundary cooperation may provide a crucial pathway for building stability, peace and sustainable livelihoods.

Finland as the main donor of the Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) conducted an evaluation of three ENVSEC projects in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia to ascertain how effective the selected projects have been and whether they have contributed to reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation around environment and security issues.

The evaluation, conducted in September-October 2010, concludes that the assessed ENVSEC projects are relevant and reasonably effective. It notes that Finland's contribution to the Initiative has been utilized in accordance with the agreed objectives and project documentation. According to the evaluators, these ENVSEC project activities address relevant environmental issues in the target countries, also from the point of view of environment and security inter-linkages, and that the ENVSEC projects are contributing to the reduction of environment and security risks.

The evaluation concludes that the ENVSEC projects are making progress, help to build confidence and generate regional cooperation in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia, and have generally gained the support of key authorities. It notes that the ENVSEC Initiative itself is often not known to local and national stakeholders of the projects. Furthermore, the security benefits, or the specific outputs to reduce vulnerabilities of the project activities are rarely monitored or reported, which undermines the possibility to learn, replicate and further build the knowledge base on environment and security inter-linkages.

The objective of the evaluation is to give guidance to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland concerning the financing of the second phase of the partnership 2011-2013. The report recommends, continued support from Finland to the ENVSEC Initiative, however, taking careful note of the identified risks and areas for improvement.

The report also concludes that Finland should consider its leading role in the ENVSEC Initiative as a unique opportunity for Finland— both internationally and domestically - in the nexus of environment, security and sustainable poverty reduction. The findings and recommendations of the report can serve as input to these deliberations.



1. Introduction

1.1 Evaluation background and context

The Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) was launched in 2003, guided by the understanding that the destruction and over-exploitation of natural resources and ecosystems can threaten the security of communities and nations. The ENVSEC also builds on the vision that good environmental governance and transboundary cooperation may provide a crucial pathway for building stability, peace and sustainable livelihoods.

The purpose of the ENVSEC Initiative is to contribute to reduction of environment and security risks and strengthened cooperation among and within countries. The ENVSEC partners provide a multi-stakeholder based analysis of environment and security risks as well as address the identified risks and environmental legacies in Eastern Europe, South Eastern Europe, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia.

The Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) is a partnership of six international organizations (UNEP, UNDP, UNECE, OSCE, REC and NATO as an associated partner). Activities to achieve that goal include policy integration, capacity building of government institutions, hotspot risk mitigation, and civil society strengthening and promotion of good environmental governance. The project contributes to improved knowledge, understanding and management of environmental and security risks.

The main beneficiaries of this project include policy-makers and experts of relevant Ministries (Environment and Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Economic Development, Emergencies, Transport and Industry, Agriculture, etc.), local government agencies, protected area administrations, local municipalities, and civil society organizations. Indirect beneficiaries will be the populations of the recipient countries.

The first phase of the partnership between the ENVSEC partners and the Government of Finland covers the period 2009-2010, with the scope for a second phase for the period 2011-2013. The first phase is implemented between July 2009 and December 2010 in three regions: the Southern Caucasus, Central Asia and Eastern Europe (Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine) for which region-specific objectives have been set.

Finland is currently ENVSEC's main donor with a contribution of €2.6 million to activities in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia for the period 2009-2010 within the framework of the Wider Europe Initiative, and a contribution of €2.5 million to activities in South-Eastern Europe for the period 2009-2012.

In order to further proceed with its assistance to ENVSEC in 2011-2013, Finland is conducting an evaluation of some of the ENVSEC projects in the three regions of Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia to ascertain how effective they have been in the past and how Finland's past contributions to the initiative have been utilised.



1.2 Evaluation objectives

Purpose and overall objective of the evaluation

The purpose for the evaluation is to give guidance and recommendations to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland for the financing of the second phase of the partnership. The overall objective is to assess the extent to which the first phase of the partnership has contributed to reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation around environment and security issues.

Specific objectives

In order to respond to the overall objectives, the evaluation team assessed in more detail the extent to which a number of ENVSEC projects have met their objectives. In particular, the evaluation assessed the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, and potential for impact and sustainability, of three ENVSEC interventions, chosen for evaluation by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland based on the recommendation by the consultant from a list provided by the ENVSEC Secretariat. Each of the projects should be from different regions and executed by different lead organisations.

In addition to the five central evaluation criteria, as defined by OECD/DAC and noted in the TOR, the evaluation team will look for additional information about coordination, lessons learned and potential replicability in ENVSEC interventions.

The three case studies, taking careful note of their representativeness, serve as central input to the overall conclusions and recommendations to be given to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. The evaluation was commissioned by the Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Finland.

1.3 Evaluation approach and methodology

Evaluation approach

The evaluation has been conducted in three main phases, through the combination of desk research and field work (with visits to three ENVSEC projects in the field) and subsequent final reporting. The assignment, including field missions to the selected three projects, was conducted during September- October 2010. The key tasks during the three evaluation phases were as follows:

Phase I

The desk study consisted of the following key steps:



- Selection of three ENVSEC Projects for the evaluation from a list provided by the ENVSEC Secretariat. The criteria used for selecting three projects for evaluation where as follows:
 - Project has already progressed
 - Projects in different areas
 - Rather large than small projects
 - Project preferably implemented by more than one ENVSEC partner
 - Projects funded or co-funded by Finland
- Collection and analysis of relevant documentation for ENVSEC as a whole and the projects selected for the evaluation;
- Elaboration of a discussion guide / checklist with key questions for interviews with ENVSEC agencies, stakeholders, beneficiaries and other donors in order to ensure a harmonized approach;
- Preparation of a visit plan (the agenda of the visits was agreed upon with the project managers, the relevant ENVSEC agencies, national/regional project partners and other stakeholders).

Phase II

The field work consisted of the following key steps:

- Visits, and/or interviews, and/or meetings in the regions of ENVSEC operations with:
 - ENVSEC Secretariat, Office of the Senior Programme Manager in Geneva
 - ENVSEC Regional Desk Officers and managers of the projects selected for the evaluation;
 - ENVSEC partners in the field offices;
 - Major government stakeholders (e.g. Ministries of the Environment, others), civil society representatives and other relevant stakeholders;
 - Key donors involved in the sectors of relevance from ENVSEC point of view
 - Local and community authorities, where relevant.
- De-briefing in each of the regions

Phase III

The reporting phase, which included a debriefing meeting with the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Helsinki 19.10.2010.

Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions



In order to guide the desk study and the subsequent work in the field, the evaluation criteria were broken down into research questions to ensure a harmonized approach by the team of evaluators when assessing the three interventions. The list of key questions is presented in the Annex 4, which describes the evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions/tasks for each criteria.

Evaluation team and resources

The evaluation was conducted by a team of three experts from Gaia Consulting Ltd (Mr. Pasi Rinne, Mr. John Carstensen and Mr. Mikko Halonen) within 33 man-days during a period of two months in September-November 2010.

1.4 Report structure

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the ENVSEC Initiative and presents the objectives and methods of the evaluation assignment. Chapter 2 presents the evaluation findings from the three projects selected for more detailed evaluation as well as the findings concerning the ENVSEC Secretariat.¹ The main evaluation conclusions and recommendations are summarized in chapter 3, after which a number of Annexes are presented.

¹ In addition, chapter 2 contains a brief summary of a rapid review of project “Regional Cities and Capacity Building in Tbilisi”.



2. Evaluation findings

2.1 Enhancing National Capacity on Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus

Project description and objectives

The statistical data and reports of the last decade indicate that the problem of the forest fires is quite common in the South Caucasus. Wildfires if not well managed might pose not only immediate risk to the population of the surrounding area but can have serious consequences in terms of increased threats of landslides, mudflows or floods. In addition, if wildfires occur in a politically sensitive area this might become additional source of contention between countries and have a negative impact on the overall security situation in the region.

In the South Caucasus (SC) the extent of damage of the wildfires is largely attributed to the limited capacity in fire management agencies that deal with fire prevention and response.

The Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus -project (hereafter referred as project) is based on earlier assessments of particular wildfires (particular reference to the ENVSEC's response to the 2006 wildfires in Nagorno-Karabakh zone of conflict) in the region in 2006 and 2008. As an outcome from the assessments, the project aims to further strengthen the national fire management capacities in SC countries and will conduct separate national trainings in Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia for firefighters and local communities. In Georgia the project objective is also to provide the Ministry of Environment of Georgia technical assistance in developing a policy paper for the national forest fire management and an implementation strategy. The project has also provided an opportunity for the national fire and emergency experts of the South Caucasus countries and South-East Europe to participate in a regional seminar on wildfires which has been organized by the Global Fire Monitoring Center (GFMC) and the General Directorate of Forestry of Turkey, Department of Forest Protection and Fire Control, in Turkey.

The project document presents itself as structured and clear on activities, deliverables and partners. It also highlights successfully the environment and security linkages, and includes a short log-frame. The project is coordinated by OSCE Secretariat and the main partner is Global Fire Monitoring Center.

The evaluation reviewed the project document and extensive list of background documents and progress reports provided by the ENVSEC secretariat, regional coordinator, national



coordinator and the project manager. Evaluator met with respective country teams from the three countries, several stakeholders and held specific discussion with the project manager. In addition, the evaluator participated in the regional meeting of the ENVSEC Initiative in Tbilisi in 5 – 6 October 2010. The project was presented and discussed in the meeting.

The evaluation takes note of the fact that the project has started recently, and will not be completed before mid-2011. Therefore, the evaluation has not aimed to assess the results but primarily the relevance of the project idea, and, as far as possible, effectiveness and sustainability of the activities to date.

Findings

Relevance

Despite of the fact that South Caucasus countries have differences in terms of types of forests, forest ownership structures and forest management and administrative structures, and wildfire problems are not alike in the three countries, all key stakeholders confirm that the type of training that the project provides is needed in all countries, and the project is relevant.

All three countries consider wildfires or forest fires a growing concern. In addition to particular issues related to the conflict zones, traditional agricultural measures and inadequate public awareness of the risks, climate change is noted as one of the key reasons for concerns. In all countries specific training of the practitioners and administration is needed. Most of the discussions also note that regional and international cooperation is needed in order to have an effective fire management capacity.

Azerbaijan has already somewhat developed cooperation arrangements on the subject matter with Russia and Belorussia, and similar arrangements are under development with Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Forest fires are not considered as very typical problem in Azerbaijan, but increased public awareness and training for the practitioners are needed. The project and the training planned is expected be of significant help to the relevant authorities.

Forest fires are a great problem in Armenia, and summer 2010 was particularly difficult (more than 1200 fires). In addition to training, the country lacks sufficient hardware for effective forest fire fighting. The project is also expected to strengthen the institutional capacity of the forest management to implement forest fire prevention.

Discussions with respective authorities in Georgia suggest that additional resources will be needed in Georgia to implement effective wildfire management. It has been noted that while training on international practices has been useful, it should be (more) applicable to local situation. Existing inter-ministerial (agency) mechanisms has been discussed and the need for the proposed Inter-Agency Committee for Fire Management should be further discussed (specially with MIA) based on the study (on the existing national legislative,



regulatory and institutional framework of the forest and land management in Georgia and how it is addressing issues of reduction and prevention of wildfire hazard) currently under way. Discussions suggest that, in particular, more effective coordination of the (80) local emergency centres should be put in place to ensure adequate information sharing and systematic prevention and response measures.

Efficiency

As the project is still under implementation the efficiency of the project has not been assessed. However, it is noted that the ENVSEC structure helps to share information about the project. As noted in the above chapter, the project meets national needs of the three countries, and that the ENVSEC project selection has succeeded in generating a project that meets the key criteria of the countries as well as to reflect an issue with relevance for environment and security in the region. Reportedly, the ENVSEC process has also helped in organising reasonable national consultations. However, the project initiation process has not involved all key stakeholders.

The project is behind the timetable presented in the project documentation. Progress reports have not revised the timetable of activities. As per the ENVSEC project guidance, each implementing agency is responsible for reporting on the progress and to apply their monitoring and evaluation principles. The monitoring and evaluation plans of the project were not clear to the technical coordination partners, and the evaluation considers that streamlined monitoring and evaluation practices could further help to communicate results and highlight specific ENVSEC aspects of the projects.

Effectiveness

The project has made headway largely in accordance with the original plan and the (few) activities to date have met the expectations of the key beneficiaries.

The evaluation takes note of the aspiration to closely coordinate the implementation of the project in Armenia with the on-going UNDP/GEF project on “Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia”. It is indeed opportune that the UNDP/GEF adaptation project considers forest fire issue within the scope of the project, and moreover, that the ENVSEC wildfire management project seeks concrete synergies with such a larger project.

On a more general note, effectiveness of the ENVSEC Initiative could benefit from more active partnerships with other relevant on-going and planned activities. In particular, such as TAIX Twinning activities could offer useful opportunities to leverage effectiveness. For example, in Georgia, TAIX activities include a project that works with the Department of the Emergency Management of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.



The progress reporting does not particularly address how the project reduces environment and security problems. A more systematic progress reporting practices (which are reportedly underway) could further strengthen the effectiveness of the ENVSEC Initiative.

Impact

The project aims to strengthen the wildfire management capacities in three countries. The project provides training to practitioners, administration and local communities. According to discussions with numerous stakeholders, the training, assessments and the policy development (in Georgia) will indirectly contribute to the safety of communities living in areas prone to forest fires. Furthermore, it is considered to raise the awareness on the issue and linkages to other hazards such as erosion and landslides, and the project is seen to clarify the roles of different authorities and thereby increases the chances to improved response. In bringing the actors together, the project advocates for adequate national and regional cooperation on both the response and prevention. As such, the project has a very positive impact.

In terms of the environment and security impact, some of the stakeholders suggest that the project could also do more to help to ease the tension in the conflict zones. The current form of the project does not, however, include the required resources and tools for such interventions.

The project document notes that the focus area of the project is largely a domain for male fire fighters, but that in some regions females can have significant role in various aspects related to fire management. Based on the documentation, some female participants have attended project activities to date, but further efforts could be done to invite participating organizations to deploy women specialists.

Sustainability

Forest fires are an issue of concern in all three countries, and the strengthened capacity that the project aims to deliver, will be much needed. Discussions with the stakeholders, particularly in Georgia and Armenia, note that additional resources will be needed to achieve adequate capacity to manage forest fires. In Armenia, the UNDP/GEF project might provide an opportunity for continued support. In Georgia, the stakeholders have already requested that ENVSEC should consider provision of a follow-up project that would provide hardware and resources for the administration to implement the policy paper that the current ENVSEC project will generate.

The project partners signaled interest to commence discussion on the follow-up activities but there was no evidence of particular exit strategy for the project. Discussions with the stakeholders suggest that there are very limited capacities in the countries to assess the economic value forests and natural assets and of the damage caused by the forest fires. Thereby, there was no knowledge of assessments on reasonable economic investments in forest fire prevention and management.



Further findings

While the ENVSEC Initiative coordination mechanisms have positively developed during the last few years, progress reporting and lessons learnt processes could be further elaborated. The wildfire management project include elements with potential replicability and significant synergies with possible other ENVSEV or non-ENVSEC projects on climate adaptation and environmental (capacity building) projects (e.g. forest management and transboundary nature protection initiatives).

Discussion and concluding remarks

The project is relatively small, and implemented under the coordination of one ENVSEC partner (OSCE) alone. The project clearly benefits from the drive and vast expertise of Global Fire Monitoring Centre.

The project addresses an issue of relevance, and helps the countries of the region to take essential initial steps towards improved capacity on forest fire management. The countries are likely to need further assistance in setting up adequate policies and practices on forest fire management, and would benefit from regional cooperation. The project has a potential to leverage funding from other sources to address the problem of forest fires, to further develop the institutional capacities on emergency management and to initiate regional activities.



2.2 Capacity Building for Cooperation on Dam Safety in Central Asia

Project description and objectives

ENVSEC work in Central Asia started in 2002 with the identification of geographic hotspots and major linkages between environment and security issues. Since then ENVSEC partners have undertaken several assessments of environment and security related issues in the region and initiated a number of projects aiming to address identified environmental and security concerns. ENVSEC has highlighted the growing demand for water coupled with increased pollution, changes in hydrological regimes, and legacy of past industrial and agricultural practices as key environmental issues threatening human security in the region.

In this chapter, the findings from the evaluation of the *Dam safety in Central Asia: capacity building and sub-regional cooperation* – project, will be presented. The project was preceded by a pilot phase in 2004-2006 (so called phase I, also funded by Finland), which served as basis for the current, still on-going project. The project was integrated into the ENVSEC programme for Central Asia 2007-2009 under the capacity building pillar and respectively for the 2010-2012 ENVSEC work programme under priority 1, i.e. dialogue and cooperation on shared resources.²

The overall objective of the Dam Safety project is improved national dam safety legal and institutional frameworks as well as regional cooperation mechanisms on dam safety in Central Asia. In particular, under the project the following main goals were envisaged to be achieved:

- A. The Governments of the participating countries have introduced or revised national regulatory frameworks for dam safety.
- B. The Governments of the participating countries have set up a regional cooperative framework on dam safety and sustained intraregional cooperation, including the introduction and maintenance of early warning systems for dam accidents.
- C. The Governments of the participating countries have the necessary documentation and technical capacity for harmonizing technical regulations and procedures for the monitoring and evaluating of dam performance.

² With the 2010-2012 ENVSEC priorities for Central Asia consisting of Priority 1: Dialogue and cooperation on shared resources, Priority 2: Reduction of risks to security and stability from hazardous practices, Priority 3: Increased resilience to security impacts of climate change, and Priority 4: Raising awareness and strengthening capacities and participatory mechanisms on environment and security issues.



- D. The Governments of the participating countries have better access to potential sources of technical assistance for rehabilitation of dams and improvement of monitoring and early warning systems.

In line with project documents the project was originally scheduled for 2007 -2010 with UNECE acting as the implementing ENVSEC organization. The participating countries cover all five Central Asian countries, i.e. Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, with government agencies dealing with safety of dams and other large hydraulic structures (HS) being the main target group of the project.

This project evaluation is based on the available project documentation³, ENVSEC documentation as well as other documentation consulted (see list of documents consulted in Annex 1), as well as stakeholder consultations and interviews (see Annex xx for list of people consulted). An evaluation mission was conducted to Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan 4-8.2010. In line with the TOR for this evaluation the findings are reported along the five key OECD DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impacts and sustainability.

Evaluation findings

Relevance

Based on available documentation and stakeholder consultations (despite the field mission covering only two out of five participating countries in the region) it can be concluded that the project is addressing key concerns in the region in the nexus of water, agriculture, energy and environment. Even if the security links are not always expressed explicitly in the project documentation (be it project proposal /project doc, progress reports, meeting reports etc.) or in discussions with stakeholders in the region, the environment and security interlinkages are very familiar to all, and regularly noted in day to day life of populations in the region as well as in political tensions between the five countries, typically expressed through “tensions between upstream (Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan) and downstream countries (Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan”.⁴ Naturally the same concerns raise tensions occasionally also within the respective countries.

The pilot phase in 2006 served as a basis to ensure the relevance of the 2007-2010 projects, by confirming the needs of the participating countries, by establishing a set of joint priorities and preparing background documents that could be used as a basis for the actual project activities. In particular the pilot phase (or phase I) initiated a process of optimizing and harmonizing national legislation as well as of developing regional cooperation on dam safety with the participation of all five Central Asian countries. A Model National Law on

³ As key project document serving the project proposal dated 24.7.2010.

⁴ The upstream countries being highly dependant on the energy production through hydropower, while the downstream countries being highly dependant on the water for agricultural irrigation purposes.



the Safety of Hydraulic Structures (HS) and a draft Regional Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of HS Safety was developed in the framework of the project's first phase.

The project has during phase II continued addressing and advancing the legislative frameworks, technical cooperation and capacities as well as regional cooperation, in line with the project objectives, noted above. The relevance of the project remains very high despite rather slow overall progress in the resolution of the main water challenges in the region. The April 2009 International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea (IFAS) meeting between heads of states for all the five Central Asian countries improved the overall framework also for advancing dam safety matters in the region. While some stakeholders criticize the capacity of IFAS to efficiently advance regional cooperation and concretely build confidence between the countries, it remains the key forum for regional dialogue and umbrella for joint activities. Reportedly, dam safety will be included as a priority theme under the third IFAS (the Aral Sea Basin Programmes, ASBP – 3 for 2011-2015). In conclusion, the relevance of this project is very high. It addresses expressed concerns of local and regional partners and operates in a highly challenging environment.

Efficiency

The project follows-up on the pilot phase conducted in 2006 (so called phase I), and according to project documents was initially scheduled for a three year period, September 2007- August 2010 (project proposal, dated 24 July 2007). Eventually the project (phase II) was launched in December 2007, and is on-going at the time of this evaluation. According to latest information the project has been extended until mid 2011. Hereby the project is time-wise slightly behind schedule. More important than the slight delay, in comparison to original planning, is for project implementing agency and its partners to ensure during the next few months a solid hand-over and/or project follow-up preparation (see also chapter Sustainability, below).

During project implementation, minor delays and changes have been introduced to project activities, taking note of political tensions and/or particular challenges in some countries (see first and second UNECE Interim Reports⁵). The implementing organisation and UNECE coordinator for the project has rapidly reacted to these changes in close cooperation with the local partners, and, when needed, slightly modified the project activities. The active approach and well functioning communication between the UNECE project coordinator and the national focal points has been a precondition for the chosen project implementation framework, which entails project management without country office/presence in the respective countries. The fact that work planning for the following year has been prepared

⁵ UNECEC 1st Interim Report (dated 8.1.2009) and UNECE second Interim Report (dated 23.11.2009). E.g. taking note of these external pressures, national meetings have not been organized in all countries and temporarily national focal points have not been temporarily nominated by all countries, at all times.



at the end of each year jointly with the national focal points, has probably contributed to keeping the work programme realistic and ensuring the commitment of national partners to the implementation.

With regards use of resources, the project operates with an annual budget of approximately 100 000 Euros. According to project documents and progress reports, the funds have been used in line with plans, with major part being directed to national and regional meetings, training and capacity building. The local partners / coordinators in the respective five Central Asian countries (officially nominated by the respective countries), receive a monthly compensation of approximately 200 USD for their focal point role and tasks. This compensation can be considered a cost-efficient way of securing commitment and continued local networking services. With regards to external expertise during the project, primarily local and regional experts have been used, whenever feasible and expertise has been appropriate.⁶ The level of compensation received by the local experts can be considered appropriate. Overall, international experts have been used only when needed, and the funds allocated to international consultants have remained below 20% of annual budget (including consultant expert services and travel).⁷ The UNECE overhead is 13%. Funds not used during a certain budget year, have been transferred to following year, supporting flexibility and overall efficient use of resources.

Effectiveness

The project has listed four main outputs (see above, Project Description and Objectives: points A-D) as well as respective clusters of activities, which should allow reaching the identified project outcomes and overall project goal.

With regards to introducing or revising national regulatory frameworks for dam safety,⁸ based on the modal national law produced during pilot phase, amended drafts have been produced in all five Central Asian countries taking note of the national circumstances and particularities. A law addressing dam safety has subsequently been passed in Uzbekistan, and the national institution responsible for dam safety has been systematically strengthened. In Kazakhstan legislation is being passed and the discussions have recently also identified a potential institution⁹ that could be assigned the national responsibility for dam safety. Reportedly, legislation is now in Tajik parliament, and might be soon approved with minor amendments. In Turkmenistan legislation is advancing rather slowly and the model law has not been approved in parliament. With regards to Kyrgyzstan, the evaluation could not make a solid assessment of the latest status of progress.

⁶ The regional project coordinator (based in Bishkek) is paid 900 USD per month.

⁷ International consultant (based in Bangkok) is paid 7000 USD per month and the Russian experts/consultants (funded by Russia) ca 4000 USD per month.

⁸ Project output A.

⁹ Under the Ministry of Emergency.



Concerning regional cooperation¹⁰, the progress has been rather slow, despite continued negotiations and several rounds of new drafts of the agreement being discussed and circulated with respective national authorities. However, while agreement has been found on majority of points in the latest draft agreements, politically coloured disagreements still seem to remain and are mainly linked to transboundary responsibility and compensation issues. Taking note of few regional initiatives where all five Central Asian countries have jointly agreed upon concrete cooperation measures, some stakeholders wish to see already this progress as a “success story”. However, the project has not yet managed to produce a regional cooperative framework on dam safety.

With regards to strengthening the technical capacity and harmonizing technical regulation and procedures for monitoring, maintenance and evaluation of dam performance¹¹, the expert groups and national as well as regional training activities have contributed positively to dam safety. However, the overall technical capacity, the level of expertise and procedures and in particular the level and sharing of information needs considerable further improvements in the region.

In addition, it can be noted that the project has¹² indeed facilitated the countries to have better access to potential further sources of technical assistance for rehabilitation of dams and improvement of monitoring and early warning systems. Based on the field mission findings, several international partners (such as GTZ, USAID, EC) have expressed their interest to fund activities related to dam safety, transboundary management of water resources and peace building, regional cooperation (in the water and energy nexus). These stakeholders are aware of the Dam Safety project coordinated by UNECE and are planning to ensure close collaboration to ensure synergies and avoid overlapping.

In conclusions, the effectiveness of the project can be considered medium to high. While no detailed logframes have been produced for this project, the assessment of progress has been possible due to rather clear project objectives, systematic reporting from national and regional meetings as well as prompt delivery of additional information from the project coordinator. It should also be noted, that the very high relevance and considerable challenges that the project is addressing, partly explains the mediocre score on effectiveness. This means that some of the project risks related to potential lack of full political support from the participating countries has occasionally been realized.

¹⁰ Project output B.

¹¹ Project output C.

¹² In line with project output D.



Keeping the project as much as possible on a technical level, including project documentation rather thin, has been interpreted by the evaluator (as well as several stakeholders interviewed during evaluation assignment) as a good strategic choice by the UNECE project coordinator, Mr. Bo Libert, in an environment where a high-level policy approach or an approach that explicitly addresses security aspects, might actually have hampered concrete progress on project outputs A-D. However, a more elaborated reporting to ENVSEC partners on progress and in particular analysis on the environment and security linkages and lessons learned, is recommended to ensure that all projects implemented under the ENVSEC umbrella contribute to the specific objectives of the Initiative.

Impact

In line with the overall project goal the project has contributed to establishing improved national dam safety legal and institutional frameworks. It has also raised awareness on dam safety and advanced the negotiations and progress towards creating a regional cooperation agreement on dam safety among the five Central Asian countries. In particular, the project has established a forum for regional dialogue on dam safety issues, which allows experts from all five countries to openly discuss the current status on dam safety in respective countries as well as pinpoint critical concerns and needs for further collaboration. Hereby the project is contributing to building confidence in a region where sharing of (environmental) information is a challenge, and sometimes the overall lack of that information or solid baseline information within the countries on the state of large hydraulic structures itself is a problem.

While the project is not explicitly addressing security concerns, it is clear to all stakeholders in the region that water, and hereby dams with their various usages, is at the centre of political tensions in the region. As stated above, the project has chosen a technical and practical approach to advance dam safety and managed to establish progress on all its four main outputs. In addition to reaching progress in the four areas of outputs, the project has established an important forum for regional cooperation on dam safety, allowing the representatives from the five countries to share information, also debate controversial issues and learn from each others. This is an important contribution to the confidence building in the region.

It is also good to note that the project was integrated under the ENVSEC umbrella as it was already on-going. This probably, at least partly, explains why stakeholders in the region do not know about or associate the project as an “ENVSEC project”. From the point of view of the project’s actual environment and security outcomes, this is actually irrelevant. However, as stated above, it would be good for the ENVSEC Initiative to systematically collect information from all the ENVSEC projects and lessons learned to further build the knowledge base about environmental vectors in creating mistrust and igniting conflicts and/or building confidence and peace.



Sustainability

The project has several components that support the likely continuation of the project benefits, once the intervention is ending. However, the progress reached so far is still fragile, and several measures are needed to ensure progress towards the overall goal of the project.

The project implementation is building on input from national coordinators which have been committed to project activities, in many cases since the pilot phase prior to 2007. While the awareness raising and establishment of a forum for transboundary dialogue are extremely important from the confidence building perspective, the project has also established concrete legal frameworks and technical standards, which will be present and require follow-up and enforcement by respective national authorities after project implementation. The project has also contributed to raise attention among other international partners, which have expressed an interest to provide further support to transboundary management of water resources, regional cooperation on water and energy as well as safety of hydraulic structures. In part this positive finding can be attributed to the UNECE project coordinator, who seems to be well appreciated in the region, and has actively kept key stakeholders well informed also of this particular project.¹³ And, finally, dam safety has been identified by the heads of states in the region as a priority concern and reportedly will be included into the third IFAS Aral Sea action Programme for 2011-2015.

However, while legislation on dam safety seems to be advancing in the respective countries, and might be in place in 2010-2011, it will be critical to ensure that suitable institutions will be identified or established, trained and resourced to enforce the legislation appropriately. With regards to the regional agreement on dam safety, much more time will most probably be required to reach a deal, despite progress reached during the second phase of the Dam Safety project. Successful implementation of projects under the Aral Sea Basin Programmes (ASBP – 3: in 2011-2015) might pave the way for a regional agreement in the near future. Some stakeholders see potential (unilateral) investments in hydropower in the upstream countries as a serious threat to a regional agreement of any kind (including dam safety) and encourage the Dam Safety project to try to seize the window of opportunity that seems to be currently present.

In conclusion, the project has built several components that support continued project benefits after the donor funded intervention is completed. However, there are also several arguments, which would support considering further follow-up measures, at the end of the project, currently foreseen to be completed in mid-2011.

Discussion and concluding remarks

As noted above, the project generally scores well on the key OECD DAC evaluation criteria. Still, the evaluation identifies some areas of improvement in project implementation,

¹³ UNECE is coordinating also several other projects in the region.



particularly related to monitoring and reporting. From the point of view of the ENVSEC Initiative and its overall objective to contribute to reduction of environment and security risks and strengthened cooperation among and within countries, the Dam safety project is at the core of the Initiatives intentions. This evaluation also identifies some particular areas of improvement and suggestions for follow-up measures from this ENVSEC perspective.

This particular project is not known in the region as an ENVSEC project. However, while addressing national dam safety legal and institutional frameworks as well as regional cooperation mechanisms on dam safety in Central Asia, the project is integrally building confidence and trust in a region where the respective five countries rarely cooperate on concrete matters. In addition to providing a forum for dialogue, the project also establishes more permanent outputs (legislation, standards, identifies institutions responsible for dam safety) and builds capacity and expertise, which serve as concrete vectors for confidence building and practical cooperation. From the point of view of the beneficiaries it is irrelevant whether the project is an “ENVSEC project”, and as noted above, in many cases it may be beneficial for the project not to flag and highlight the security interlinkages strongly in project implementation.

From the ENVSEC point of view, however, it would be crucial that the project would explicitly report also on the security & environment benefits, lessons learned, that would provide input to building the knowledge base about environment and security linkages, provide the arguments for why ENVSEC is relevant and useful (so far this project seems to have reported only on the practical progress of its four project components but not on the ENVSEC’s perspective as such). This is even more relevant for ENVSEC projects, such as this one, which are being implemented by only one of the partner organizations. This would also help in providing guidance on “project positioning”, i.e. how to position the respective project on the environment and security axis and how to communicate about it, in order allow efficient and effective implementation of forthcoming ENVSEC projects.

Another question raised by several stakeholders in the region, relates to this project as well as more broadly to the ENVSEC Initiative. In particular, while strongly supporting a potential continuation of the project beyond 2011 (speaking of a possible phase III), many stakeholders would encourage including a local level and/or practical dam safety component (a “pilot dam” component). Several stakeholders suggested that through including e.g. a hydraulic structure case study, putting into practice “in the field” the step-wise improved legislation and procedures for assessing, monitoring and communicating about dam safety, would provide valuable further benefits, strengthen the respective experts and institutions (where already existing), show tangible benefits and also strengthen motivation. From ENVSEC point of view, a dam safety project implemented on local level in a transboundary context could concretely show the benefits of transboundary cooperation and joint management of water (and energy) resources. In many cases, local small scale conflicts can serve to ignite wider security tensions. The evaluation team believes that the ENVSEC Initiative should increasingly report from good and practical cases of how environment and security interlinkages have been successfully addressed.



2.3 Transboundary cooperation and sustainable management in the Dniester river basin, phase 3

Project description and objectives

The project document for Dniestre-3 presents itself as well structured with clear objectives and activities, expected outcomes and assumptions all articulated in a log-frame. The overall goal is “Improved environmental situation in the Dniestre River Basin through enhanced cooperation between Moldova and Ukraine and according to the principles of Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM)” and a series of activities and outputs that have been articulated as objectives. The most prominent is the development of a new bilateral Dniestre River Basin Agreement. There is no reference to security issues or to the situation of Transdnistrie in the log-frame, but the narrative part of the project document briefly addresses security related issues.

From 2004, upon specific requests of Moldova and Ukraine, OSCE and UNECE in cooperation with authorities and NGOs in Moldova (including the Transdnistrian region) and Ukraine implemented two projects in the Dniester River basin (www.dniester.org). The first project (Dniester I) resulted in a “Transboundary Diagnostic Study for the Dniester River Basin”, the Protocol of Intentions Regarding Cooperation in Environmental Rehabilitation of the Dniester River Basin (2005) signed by the key Moldovan and Ukrainian water authorities, and an established network of stakeholders in the basin.

The most important results of the successive Dniester II project, implemented as part of the ENVSEC initiative, included:

- The Action Programme to Improve Transboundary Cooperation and Sustainable Management of the Dniester River Basin in 2007-10
- draft Dniester River basin Agreement
- Regulation on stakeholder participation in the activities of the institution of Plenipotentiaries and
- draft Regulation on cooperation of the sanitary-epidemiological services of the two states.

The following specific issues are incorporated in the Dniester-3 project to be dealt with in the context of the Action Programme adopted in 2007:

- the finalisation of the Moldovan-Ukrainian Agreement on the Dniester River basin and the set-up of an institutional mechanism for its implementation
- improvement of transboundary communication and cooperation on sanitary-epidemiological issues
- stronger integration of biodiversity considerations into sectoral policy (e.g. fisheries, hydro-power energy production, water abstraction for agriculture etc.)



- establishment of a pilot transboundary information management system for the Dniester River basin to improve exchange of information for decision making.

The project also aims to build confidence through cooperation at the expert level between Moldova and the breakaway Transnistrian region although specific objectives and outcomes to this effect are not articulated in the project document.

The OCEEA holds the project management function through a project manager that administratively resides in the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine (PCU). The Project Management salary and expenses are paid from the project, and the immediate supervisor is a Programme Officer in the OCEEA. Project activities are co-ordinated with the OSCE Mission to Moldova during the course of project implementation.

The field mission conducted interviews with a wide range of stakeholders from Chisinau, Moldova, the Transnistre region, local stakeholders in Odessa, Ukraine and national stakeholders in Kiev, Ukraine. Both governmental and non-governmental stakeholders were interviewed and documentation of implementation of activities was received and reviewed.

Relevance

All stakeholders confirmed the relevance of the project to pursue the environmental objectives of the agreed Action Plan, which was established by the previous phase of the project.

The project is the third stage in the bilateral collaboration between Moldova and Ukraine to manage their shared water resource in the river Dniestre. The project activities have been defined from the outcome of the previous project (Dniestre-2) and are selected extracts of the Action Plan that was a key outcome of that project. The Action Programme and the proposed implementation mechanism received formal endorsement through letters of support from Apele Moldovei, the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Moldova, the State Committee on Water Management of Ukraine, the State Hydrometeorological Service of Ukraine, and the Ministry of Protection of Natural Environment of Ukraine.

All project stakeholders identified the development of the basin agreement as the key objective and activity of the project with all other objectives/activities as sub-components thereof.

This objective is hugely relevant to the environment and water authorities in both countries, but rarely specifically in the context of security or the status of the region of Transnistre. The project touches on issues such as water quality, monitoring, fisheries and information management that are relevant to Transnistria, but most project activities are focused on environmental problems outside of, and unrelated to that region, such as hydropower issues in the Northern part of the river basin.

The project document does not attempt explicitly to link to the security situation and even project document statements about the environmental situation being made worse by the frozen conflict are dismissed by project stakeholders. All stakeholders, however,



acknowledge the improved communications at both political level between the two countries and at expert level among the authorities in both Chisinau, Tiraspol, Odessa and Kiev. The OSCE described the need for the practical, confidence building actions rather than collaboration that raises issues of formal recognition of the breakaway region.

The project is therefore highly relevant for the confidence building aspect of environment and security and relevant for the environmental objectives, but it is unclear if it has removed any specific environmental threats to the security situation.

Efficiency

The implementation of the third phase has primarily focused on facilitating meetings of stakeholders. It has been affected by slow release of project funds, but has managed to keep the momentum of stakeholder interaction despite these constraints.

The project implementation is well coordinated by the OSCE and the project is in some ways a success story for joint implementation between three organisations in the ENVSEC Initiative. Each of the organisations is responsible for one or more of the project activities with clear divisions of responsibility. It appears, however, as if these different components are implemented somewhat independently of each other and the full potential for synergies has not been achieved.

The GIS activities that are highly relevant in their own right, are for example not supporting useful mapping efforts by local NGOs who are supported by other parts of the project for their awareness raising efforts.

The delay of funding for project activities has led to delays and stipulated time-lines have not been followed. The project completion is therefore delayed and the donor has been informed and extended the pledge, but a revised implementation plan has not been developed.

Some project activities appear not to have been pursued which may affect the longer terms sustainability of the project. The feasibility study for the sanitary-epidemiological monitoring, for example, appears not to have been carried out prior to the actual sampling, although the parameters for the monitoring have been negotiated among the involved experts. A draft assessment report for the monitoring dated April 2010 concludes: "While there is definitely room for improvement, it should be acknowledged that both countries have established rather well developed monitoring programmes in the trans-boundary sections of the Dniester River. In addition, already reasonable levels of co-operation and joint activities between the countries exist" and "the current financial and economical situation in Moldova and Ukraine is not very favourable for further expanding the (transboundary) monitoring programmes". The report is regarded as the feasibility study for the sanitary-epidemiological monitoring, but it appears that its conclusions have not been fully incorporated in the project implementation, perhaps due to the lateness of the report, which is still a draft.

This means that it is unclear if funding will be available to continue the full range of monitoring unless project funding is forthcoming. Although this concern is important for the



sustainability from an environmental health point of view, it is clear that the joint monitoring has been extremely successful in building confidence and has reduced and removed the perception of environmental threats to the down-stream area of the river by documental actual pollution levels.

Although the project successfully has engaged local NGOs in its activities there is no evidence that alternative ways of implementing the project activities for example through NGOs or local, urban environmental authorities have been fully explored.

The project monitoring and reporting takes place in connection with annual meetings and a project reporting format is under development by the secretariat. At present the monitoring and reporting requirements are not fully adequate to be used as a project management tool, for example to adjust project implementation schedules and activities or decisions on redistribution of funds. Project progress is not systematically checked against the project document

The purpose of the monitoring and reporting primarily fulfils the purpose of tracking the overall use of funds.

Effectiveness

The project has successfully pursued the majority of the environmental objectives articulated in the project document.

The project has also successfully established and maintained confidence building measures, primarily at expert and government official levels. It is worth noting that several government officials had well established working relationships during the time of the Soviet Union. Those links diminished with the establishment of independent states and funding for some of their functions and opportunities to collaborate disappeared. The project has successfully enabled these contacts to work together with a positive result for both environmental and security issues.

The project has therefore reached the right target groups and used the environmental agenda effectively. There is little evidence of the project addressing specific environmental threats to security. It is, however, not clear from the project document that any such specific environmental threats to security existed at the outset as the statement in the project document is very generic. Some activities (joint monitoring) have helped remove a perceived environmental threat by establishing mutually recognised data sets.

The project has also contributed to funds being mobilised from other sources by stakeholders, such as the World Bank funding sought by Moldova on hydroelectricity generation, but such secondary fundraising and related project activities are not monitored.

All stakeholders highlight the value of the various UN personnel involved in the project implementation as a significant element of successful implementation. This praise is given across the ENVSEC partners of both OSCE, UNECE and UNEP and this stakeholder assessment of the ENVSEC Initiative partners is documentation of the valuable synergy that joint project implementation has delivered.



One concern deriving from the project design is that the core component of the project, a bilateral agreement between the two countries may create potential tension with participants from the unrecognised breakaway region. This concern was raised by stakeholders from that region. The project seems not to have analysed the effect of these different forces in the implementation of the project activities.

Impact

The evaluation looked at the impact of the range of distinct project activities and outputs that was listed in the project document, namely

- signing of the new Dniester River basin Agreement (discussed and drafted in the Dniester II project)
- cooperation of the sanitary-epidemiological services of Moldova and Ukraine
- integration of the biodiversity concerns into water management, particularly focusing on the fisheries and fish diversity issues
- basin-wide exchange of information by establishing of a pilot joint trans-boundary information system to support decision making based on integrated water management principals
- raise awareness of water and environmental issues among the broad audience in Moldova and Ukraine.

- A. Some progress has been made towards signing of the river basin agreement, but there are still outstanding issues primarily around the implementation mechanism and the use of national focal points. These discussions are in themselves helpful in building confidence and it is acknowledged that outcomes that depend on political agreements are difficult to fit in to project timelines. The signing of the agreement has not yet been achieved.
- B. The cooperation around sanitary-epidemiological services has been highly successful, both in terms of bringing about dialogue and achieving a greater understanding of the levels of pollution. This effort has successfully involved local authorities in Chisinau, Tiraspol and Odessa, but may require continued project funding to sustain the work.
- C. The integration of biodiversity aspects has been somewhat successful in the draft agreement, but it is unclear and undocumented to which extent actual integration has taken place in the river management. Some biodiversity mapping has been carried out by a local NGO without direct support from the project.
- D. The aim to establish a GIS system is a useful intervention, but has not yet been achieved by the project due to delays of funding so the actual impact is difficult to assess.
- E. The project has successfully supported civil society in increasing the awareness. This part of the project appears to be under-utilized as a vehicle for greater environment and security impact.

It has also been possible to initiate climate change adaptation related activities over and above the established project interventions. It is unclear to which extent the focus of the



intervention, which was proposed recently, will focus on a full range of climate adaptation efforts or limited to no more than flood management.

The project does not appear to have paid special attention to other cross-cutting issues, although the ration of female participation in meetings has been recorded.

Sustainability

The project has undoubtedly contributed to sustained confidence building and generation of trust between environment officials in both Ukraine, Moldova and in the region of Transdnistrie. This achievement, however, is not documented in the progress reports or other analysis of the project outcomes.

From the interviews with stakeholders there is clear evidence of improved communications which reduce potential tension in the region. It may also be worth reflecting on the challenge that the ultimate outcome of interventions in the environment and security interface potentially would require that the projects show that something didn't happen (conflict or tension) due to an intervention, which is virtually impossible.. Project evaluations are normally centered on documenting that something happened as a result of an intervention, but the overarching aims of ENVSEC could be said to ensure that something doesn't happen. From this perspective it seems clear that tension in the region, including the conflict area where tanks are still present to patrol the "border", has been significantly reduced over recent years with normalisation of border crossing, trade and recently opened train transport links from Chisinau to Odessa through Tiraspol.

The environmental sustainability of most of the project interventions is also likely, but undocumented. There are some concerns, however, that the efforts to ensure integrated water resource management has not yet reached a sustained level, that biodiversity concerns are not yet integrated at field level interventions and that the sanitary-epidemiological monitoring would only be able to continue with the range of sampling if project funding continues.

The project has attracted incremental efforts to address flooding aspects of climate change adaptation, but it is too early to say if this is a truly sustainable and comprehensive effort to address CCA.

Sustainability relates to the likely continuation of results achieved by the intervention after it ends.

It is also unclear when a political agreement on the river basin management can be signed and if a joint body to oversee this can be established.

Further findings/ other remarks

The evaluation found that the project showed good collaboration between the ENVSEC partners implementing the project, although the actual implementation of the individual components of the project was somewhat compartmentalized. All stakeholders emphasized the quality of the input from the participating partners and the staff from UNEP, UNECE and OSCE.

Overview

The Dniester phase 3 project generally address environmental issues of relevance to the key stakeholders. The project has achieved outcomes relevant to the ENVSEC priorities, particularly around confidence and trust building, but has not yet documented or analysed these outcomes. The project also displays clear national and local ownership.

2.4 ENVSEC Secretariat

Project description and objectives

The ENVSEC activities are coordinated by the ENVSEC Secretariat which consists of a Senior Programme Manager, Coordination Officer, Regional Desk Officers and an Administrative Assistant. The Secretariat reports to the ENVSEC Management Board.

Government of Finland provides core funding for the ENVSEC Secretariat in order to carry through the necessary reforms (identified in the Strategic Review of the Initiative and decided by the Management Board), to reach higher levels of efficiency and effectiveness, and to equip itself with fundraising and communication tools required to make the ENVSEC Initiative sustainable.

The evaluation team reviewed key documents made available, attended a meeting of the Management Board on 11 October 2010 and interviewed selected participants from ENVSEC partner organisations as well as staff members of the secretariat.

It would be inappropriate to carry out a full evaluation of the ENVSEC secretariat given the constraints and relatively short time frame that the secretariat has had to put the so-called blue-print into action. The evaluation process has, however, identified a series of issues relevant to the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and to the organisational assessment of the Secretariat.

Findings

The secretariat performs an essential role in facilitating the coordination and operationalisation of the ENVSEC initiative and it does so with very limited resources. The ENVSEC Secretariat has only been fully operational since May 2010, and some of the crucial administrative tools such as the Trust Fund arrangement between the ENVSEC Partners has taken a somewhat longer time to reach complete operational capacity. As a result there has been some delay in fund transfers to individual project activities, but mostly funds have been available for project implementation.

During the initial phase, the Secretariat has correctly focussed on ensuring clear operational methodologies as expressed in the project and programme manual and guidelines, the so-called draft “tool-kit” (which will be renamed).



The shortcomings identified by the project evaluations regarding analysis and documentation of project outcomes and impacts are, however, inadequately addressed in the draft manual (“tool-kit”) and the guidance on project reporting is insufficient to ensure that the secretariat will be capable of substantiating in a more balanced manner the environment and security impacts and outcomes of the projects. This suggests that more attention should be given to the aspect of the outcomes and impacts in the project monitoring in addition to the current focus which is aimed at tracking funds and activity expenditure. This would also enable ENVSEC partners and other stakeholders to better analyse, learn from and replicate the achievements of ENVSEC projects.

The Secretariat performs a vital role in bringing together the partners of the initiative. UNEP has done well to ensure that the initiative is well embedded in its priority area of Disasters and Conflicts. However, the concrete results from the synergic links to different UNEP capacities related to disasters and conflicts could be further amplified.

The plans to give greater attention to communication of ENVSEC endeavours is also highly relevant to the Initiative, but must be linked to a greater understanding and analysis of the environment and security outcomes and impacts. This may link to the fact that fundraising to the secretariat and the ENVSEC Initiative at large has not yet been successful.

Conclusions

The evaluation team also found that there is a wide range of interpretations of what falls and should fall within the notion of Environment and Security from a strict conflict related understanding at one end to a wider general human security dimension, which includes energy security, food security and health. The evaluation team shares the view of the secretariat that seeking a formal definition will not be appropriate, but there is a need to strengthen the security dimension and pursue projects within a narrower, but still balanced understanding of the environmental and security interface linked to conflict and conflict resolution, possibly in relation to fragile areas. This could help the ENVSEC Initiative to more clearly articulate its unique selling point at a time where competition for funds from donors is particularly severe. In addition to supporting fund raising efforts and giving communication a clearer focus, a narrower and more crystallized understanding of the environmental and security interface would most probably facilitate project identification, enhance progress monitoring and reporting and further build the knowledge base about environment and security interlinkages and synergies.

Furthermore, this would enable a greater ability to identify the truly “ENVSEC-relevant“ projects and to ensure that project ideas are not simply what an organisation would have liked to do anyway within their mandate, but did not find funding to do otherwise. The Secretariat should therefore seek to identify clearly and explicitly the environment & security related vulnerabilities that projects intend to address.

Raising additional funds for the ENVSEC Initiative remains a priority task. In order to be able to establish strategic partnerships and a sustainable resource base for the Initiative, the

Secretariat continues to need strong support from senior management in all ENVSEC Partners as well as from existing donors.

2.5 Regional Cities and Capacity Building in Tbilisi

Project description and objectives

The ENVSEC national meeting in Georgia in 2009 considered that environmental situation in Tbilisi was one of the priority concerns. National stakeholders noted the mistrust between authorities and civil society, and the need for credible environmental evaluation of the environmental degradation in Tbilisi.

The Project Regional Cities and Capacity Building in Tbilisi addresses the concern of the national stakeholders and aims to assess the current environmental status in Tbilisi and strengthen the capacity of the local government in environmental assessment, planning and management. The project is coordinated by OSCE and implemented by UNEP in cooperation with international and national environmental experts.

In accordance with the discussions with the contractor, a brief overview evaluation of the project was included in the assignment. Therefore, the evaluation team has reviewed all relevant material related to the above project, interviewed the key project partners and participated in discussions regarding the project in Tbilisi.

Findings

The project has started recently and there are no results to be evaluated. However, the evaluation has assessed the relevance of the idea, approach, earlier round-table and planned activities.

The last environmental assessment in the city of Tbilisi was carried out in 2000. Discussions suggest that the state of environment in Tbilisi is a concern. Air pollution, water quality, municipal and industrial wastewaters as well as sanitation are some of the burning environmental issues.

Given that the city has, as late as three months ago, appointed a new department for environmental issues (Department for Ecology and Greenery), the project is very well timed. The expected assessment report and its conclusions and recommendations are expected to serve as one of the key foundations for the new department, and help to outline an environmental action plan for the city.

Resources, timetable and the methodology of the project assume that the project will be carried out based on available information. The environmental assessment, however, is likely to meet significant data gaps. While a challenge, it can also be a practical incentive to bring various stakeholders together to seek information, identify critical data gaps and



extrapolate information. The project can, thereby, help to set incentives for various organisations to cooperate and share information. In particular, the project should help to clarify the cooperation practises between the Ministry of Environment and local authorities.

Currently, the Department for Ecology and Greenery lacks basic resources and its capacity to implement any conclusions and recommendations are not secure. However, involvement of the Department for Economic Development can help to increase both the effectiveness and sustainability of the project.

The project may, though information and increased awareness, indirectly, help to initiate activities that will improve the living conditions of the people of Tbilisi. As such, the direct environmental and security aspects of the project have not been highlighted by any of the stakeholders.



3. Conclusions and recommendations

In order to receive guidance and recommendations concerning ENVSEC 2011-2013 period decision making, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs commissioned this evaluation. The overall objective was to assess the extent to which the first phase of the ENVSEC partnership has contributed to reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation around environment and security issues. In particular, the evaluation assessed the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, and potential for impact and sustainability, of three ENVSEC interventions in the three regions of Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia. In addition, the evaluation conducted a focused review of the ENVSEC Secretariat, to complement the project level evaluations.

This chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team. The conclusions and recommendations only summarize the key outcomes, and as such, cannot address all the important issues that have been brought to the knowledge by the interviewed experts, local and international stakeholders or the representatives of the ENVSEC partners. The team of evaluators expresses their gratitude to all the ENVSEC people and partners who made it possible for the team to address the selected ENVSEC activities in five countries within September and October 2010.

Based on the available material, the team of evaluators concludes that

- The ENVSEC Initiative has recently started to make headway in further developing the management and coordination tools of the Initiative, and has improved administrative capacity to implement the activities under the Initiative.
- The ENVSEC projects are relevant and reasonably effective, and that Finland's contribution to the Initiative has been utilized in accordance with the agreed documentation.
- The ENVSEC project activities address relevant environmental issues in the target countries, also from the point of view of both environment and security, and that the ENVSEC projects are contributing to the reduction of environment and security risks.
- The ENVSEC projects make progress, help to build confidence and generate regional cooperation in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia, and have generally gained the support of key authorities and other groups in the target countries, enhancing the overall sustainability of project outcomes.

The evaluation also points out that

- In some cases the ENVSEC Initiative itself is not known to the local stakeholders of the projects.



- The security benefits, or the specific outputs to reduce vulnerabilities of the project activities are rarely monitored or reported, which undermines the possibility to learn, replicate and further build the knowledge base on environment and security inter-linkages.
- Successful implementation of projects in the field have catalyzed considerable additional funding outside the ENVSEC Initiative and raised the interest of other development partners to work in the nexus of environment and security issues, and this catalytic nature of the Initiative could be further managed.
- Project design, selection as well as implementation could still pay further attention to the sustainability of the project activities, and proactively engage in developing *exit strategies*, and avoid generating false expectations about continued donor support.
- The ENVSEC Initiative itself has not made headway in raising additional funds for the Initiative, and that the sustainability of the Initiative is far from being secured.

The evaluation team notes that,

- While all the evaluated project activities clearly address environment and security concerns, none of these project activities has qualified as *flag-ship ENVSEC actions*, and this can be interpreted that the full potential to reduce security concerns through environmental actions is not capitalized.
- The ENVSEC Initiative seems, over the recent years, focus less on one of its particular assets, namely the ENVSEC assessments, and instead, risks to be seen as an additional channel to donor funding for what-ever environmental work.

The evaluation very much reaffirms the results from earlier reviews and notes that

- the ENVSEC Initiative has particular value as a unique partnership, and it is among its stakeholders considered very interesting and so far significantly successful in bringing various stakeholders together and in addressing essential environmental issues.
- environmental issues are highly relevant platforms for confidence building dialogue and interventions at a practical, operational level between stakeholders in areas of security tension and potential conflict
- it is now “Make it or break it time” for the ENVSEC Initiative. The Initiative has the initial resources, institutional and administrative capacity, as well as preliminary track-record of achievements – now the Initiative must produce results, provide systematic lessons learned and evidence for the value-add of environment & security interlinking initiatives and use the established platform to generate additional support and momentum.



With regards to the advice and recommendations to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, the evaluation also takes note that the Government of Finland is the key donor, and that the ENVSEC partners expect Finland also to guide the Initiative.

Given the progress being made and the matching objectives of ENVSEC with Finnish development aid priorities, the evaluation recommends

1. Continued support from Finland to the ENVSEC Initiative.
2. Finland should consider that its role in the ENVSEC Initiative is a unique opportunity – both internationally and domestically – to communicate about the ENVSEC goals and approach, which also very much match with the development cooperation goals of Finland.
3. Finland clearly communicates its intentions and capacities to provide the required guidance to the Initiative.
4. Finland considers terms and establishes conditions for its funding that lead to incentives of the partner organizations to invest more in the substantive development and sustainability of the Initiative. In particular, it could note that further work is needed to
 - Systematically articulate the unique environment and security vulnerabilities that the Initiative addresses;
 - Develop the assessment tools and methodologies to communicate the specific environment and security related vulnerabilities and to directly catalyze cooperation and support for actions to build resilience;
 - Monitor and report the specific ENVSEC results, outcomes and actively communicate about the success stories and lessons learned;
 - Avoid becoming a general forum for environmental cooperation, but develop means to highlight the unique value of ENVSEC approach.
 - Consider and put in place mechanisms to enable the Initiative to carry out or effectively promote *hardcore environment and security interventions* – through innovative technical or environmental diplomacy initiatives – to more directly reduce security risks in areas such as frozen conflict zones.
 - Highlight the value of the Initiative in leveraging funds, including from national budgets, to activities that contribute to the goals of the Initiative.



Annex I. Documents consulted / material reviewed

Enhancing National Capacity on Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus

- Background and Highlights of the ENVSEC Project Phase Two of the Project “Enhancing National Capacity on Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus, 30.9.2010.
- Environment and Security Initiative, Project: Phase Two – Enhancing National Capacity on Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus
- Internal Interim report on Activities in Georgia, 30.9.2010
- Internal Interim Report on Activities in Armenia, 30.9.2010
- Meeting Notes /draft. National Roundtable Meeting 4.9.2010
- Report on the existing national legislative, regulatory and institutional framework of the forest and land management in Georgia and how it is addressing issue of reduction and prevention of wildfire hazard, 25.6.2010

Dam safety in Central Asia: Capacity building for regional cooperation

- 1st UNECE Interim Report: Dam safety in Central Asia: Capacity building for regional cooperation (phase II: 2007- 2010). Project activities 1 December 2007- 30 November 2008. Dated 8/1/2009
- 2nd UNECE Interim Report: Dam safety in Central Asia: Capacity building for regional cooperation (phase II: 2007- 2010). Project activities 1 December 2008- 20 November 2009. Dated 23/11/2009
- Dam safety in Central Asia: Capacity building for regional cooperation (phase II: 2007- 2009). Project document / project proposal 24.7.2007.
- Environment and Security in the Amu Darya River Basin. DRAFT Version for ENVSEC review and consultation with country offices and experts. VER. 4.5, 21 MAY 2010
- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Work Programme January 2010 – December 2012. May 2010
- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Work Programme January 2007 – December 2009. Version January 2009
- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Transforming Environmental and Security Risks into Cooperation. Project plan under the Wider Europe Initiative of Finland, Phase I
- UNECE, 2007a. Dam safety in Central Asia: Capacity building and regional cooperation. UN Economic Commission for Europe, Geneva, The Water Series, No. 5, ISBN 978-92-1-416027-4.
- UNECE, UNESCAP, 2004. Strengthening cooperation for rational and efficient use of water and energy resources in Central Asia. Special Programme for the Economies of Central Asia (SPECA). UN Economic Commission for Europe, Geneva, ISBN 92-1-101070-5.

- Libert B, Orolbaev E and Steklov Y (2008), Water and Energy Crisis in Central Asia. China and Eurasia Forum Quarterly, Volume 6, No. 3 (2008) p. 9-20 © Central Asia-Caucasus Institute & Silk Road Studies Program. ISSN: 1653-4212
- Water management in Central Asia and the activities of UNECE v. 14/8/2008, Bo Libert, Regional Adviser on Environment, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
- Meeting documents
 - First regional meeting in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 12-13 March 2008
 - National meeting in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 14 March 2008
 - National meeting in Ashgabat, Turkmenistan, 12 June 2008
 - National meeting in Almaty, Kazakhstan, 16 June 2008
 - National meeting for dam safety cooperation in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 14 November 2008
 - Pilot regional training course on ensuring the safety of hydraulic structures in Central Asia, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 11-14 May 2009
 - Project Working Group on normative legal and technical regulation of the safety of hydraulic structures, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 14 May 2009
 - Second regional meeting in Almaty, Kazakhstan, 18-19 November 2008
 - Meeting of the Project Working Group for Development of a Draft Agreement on Cooperation with respect to the Safety of Hydraulic Structures in Central Asia, in Almaty, Kazakhstan, 27 August, 2009
 - National meeting on dam safety cooperation in Central Asia, Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 30 October 2009
 - Regional Meeting for Dam Safety Cooperation in Central Asia, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 3-4 November 2009
 - EVALUATION, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS of participants of the International Training Course on Hydraulic Engineering Installations' Safety for High-Ranking Executives from Central Asia Countries 16-20 August 2010, Moscow, Russia

Transboundary cooperation and sustainable management in the Dniester river basin, phase 3

- CIDA's ENVSEC Assessment mission, South Caucasus and Eastern Europe, February 24 – March 14, 2009; Executive Report
- Draft Report on the 4th meeting of the project “Transboundary cooperation and sustainable management in the Dniester River basin: Phase III - Implementation of the Action Programme” (DNIESTER-III) Odesa, Ukraine, 7-9 June 2010
- Draft, Transboundary monitoring of the Dniester River. Assessment and evaluation, April 2010.

- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Work Programme January 2010 – December 2012. May 2010
- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Work Programme January 2007 – December 2009. Version January 2009
- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Transforming Environmental and Security Risks into Cooperation. Project plan under the Wider Europe Initiative of Finland, Phase I
- Final Project document on Transboundary cooperation and sustainable management in the Dniester river basin: Phase III - Implementation of the Action Programme, dated 09/04/2008
- Project Fiche : ‘Environment and Security’ initiative, Reducing vulnerability to extreme floods and climate change in the Dniester river basin (Dniester III floods & climate)
- Results of Dniestre-3, March 2009 to June 2010, Tamara Kutonova, OSCE Ukraine
- Transboundary Dniester River Basin Management and International Cooperation for healthy Dniester, Proceedings of the International Conference, Odessa, September 30- October 1, 2009
- Transboundary Dniester River Basin Management and the EU Water Framework Directive, Proceedings of the International Conference, Chisinau, October 2-3, 2008, Eco-TIRAS

Regional Cities: Environmental Assessment and Capacity Building in Tbilisi

- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Regional Cities: Environmental Assessment and Capacity Building in Tbilisi.
- Minutes of the GEO-Cities Orientation and Methodology Training Workshop in Tbilisi, Georgia 6- 8 July, 2010. 14.9.210

ENVSEC Initiative Secretariat

- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Transforming risks into cooperation in Central Asia, South Caucasus and Eastern Europe. Project plan under the Wider Europe Initiative of Finland, Phase I. July 2009 – December 2010.
- The ‘Blueprint’ for strengthening the management of the Initiative (2009)
- Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC), Programme Monitoring and Reporting Kit. Draft, 1.10.2010.
- STRATEGIC REVIEW OF THE ENVSEC INITIATIVE. Final Report, Matthias Stiefel, Geneva, June 2009.
- Work Programme January 2010 – December 2012, ENVSEC May 2010
- Work Programme January 2007 – December 2009, ENVSEC January 2009 version
- Draft Programme Monitoring and Reporting Tool Kit, 1 OCTOBER 2010

Annex 2. Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

Terms of Reference

The Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) Evaluation

Part 1. Background

Environmental degradation, inequitable access to natural resources and transboundary movement of hazardous materials increase the probability of conflict and thereby pose a risk to human and even national security. Transboundary pollution often negatively affects the relations between neighbouring states sharing the common resource base. Health risks and involuntary migration due to, for example, water scarcity, inequitable access to land resources, uncontrolled stocks of obsolete pesticides or other forms of hazardous waste constitute threats to stability and peace. Ongoing disputes and disagreements over the management of natural resources shared by two or more states can deepen divides and lead to hostilities. But common problems regarding the use of natural resources may also bring people together in a positive manner. Communities and nations can build confidence with each other through joint efforts to improve the state and management of natural resources. Environmental co-operation can thereby act as an important tool for preventing conflicts.

¹⁴

The Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) is a partnership of six international organizations (UNEP, UNDP, UNECE, OSCE, REC and NATO as an associated partner) which aims to contribute to the reduction of interlinked environment and security risks through strengthened cooperation among and within countries in the pan-European region.

The overall goal of the ENVSEC initiative is to contribute to the reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation both between and within countries. Activities to achieve that goal include policy integration, capacity building of government institutions, hotspot risk mitigation, and civil society strengthening. The initiative contributes to improved knowledge, understanding and management of environmental and security risks.

The first phase of the partnership between the ENVSEC partners and the Government of Finland covers the period 2009-2010, with the scope for a second phase for the period 2011-2013. The first phase is implemented between July 2009 and December 2010 in three regions: the Southern Caucasus, Central Asia and Eastern Europe (Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine) for which region-specific objectives have been set. The main beneficiaries of this project include policy-makers and experts of relevant Ministries (Environment and Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Economic Development,

¹⁴ In: Policies for a Better Environment Progress In Eastern Europe, Caucasus And Central Asia Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2007

Emergencies, Transport and Industry, Agriculture, etc.), local government agencies and civil society organizations. Indirect beneficiaries will be the populations of the recipient countries.

Finland is currently ENVSEC's main donor with a contribution of €2.6 million to activities in Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia for the period 2009-2010, €1,5 million for the restoration of forest ecosystems damaged in armed conflict in Georgia (2010-2014) within the framework of the Wider Europe Initiative, and a contribution of €2.5 million to activities in South-Eastern Europe for the period 2009-2012. In order to further proceed with its assistance to ENVSEC in 2011-2013, Finland is conducting an evaluation of some of the ENVSEC projects in the three regions of Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia to ascertain how effective they have been in the past and how has Finland's past contributions to the initiative been utilised.

Several evaluations of ENVSEC have been carried out since its launch in 2003¹⁵. All evaluations concluded that the thematic focus of ENVSEC – environment as point of interest and cooperation between regions or nations and its regional approach are highly relevant and that ENVSEC remains unique as an innovative partnership offering an integrated response to environment and security challenges in line with the Paris Declaration Principles. Recommendations were made to strengthen the governance structure and management of the Initiative, improving national ownership, encourage collaboration with donors and other potential stakeholders, and enhance communication.

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which ENVSEC projects have met their objectives, their continued relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, and potential for impact and sustainability. Three projects will be chosen by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland based on the recommendation by the consultant from a list provided by the ENVSEC Secretariat. Each of the projects should be from different regions and executed by different lead organisations.

Part 2. Description of the Assignment

2.1. Purpose and objective of the evaluation

The purpose for the evaluation is to give guidance and recommendations to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland for the financing of the second phase of the partnership. The overall objective is to assess the extent to which the first phase of the partnership has contributed to reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation around environment and security issues.

2.2. Specific Objectives

To assess the extent to which the three chosen ENVSEC projects have met their objectives, their continued relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, and potential for impact and sustainability.

Relevance:

- To evaluate the appropriateness of the projects' objectives and their relevance to the beneficiaries, target groups and key stakeholders

¹⁵ A list from ENVSEC Secretariat in Geneva is available on demand.

Effectiveness:

- To assess how well the projects have achieved the objectives set out in the project documents
- To assess whether there has been value-added in the projects from implementation within the ENVSEC initiative and what that value added has been

Impact:

- To assess how the projects have contributed to achieving the overall goal of the initiative
- To assess the overall effects of each of the projects

Efficiency:

- To ascertain to what extent the recommendations of former evaluations have been adopted and to what extent the present ENVSEC initiative management structure creates efficiency and benefits project management, implementation, and monitoring
- To verify the adequacy of monitoring and follow up by ENVSEC partners (implementers) and the capacity of the latter to react to delays or unforeseen circumstances

Methodology

The evaluation of three ENVSEC projects will be conducted on the basis of the methodology for similar evaluations used by the Government of Finland to assess the quality of its aid programmes. The evaluation is commissioned by the Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Finland. It will consist of two phases as indicated below.

I. Desk research

- Selection of 3 ENVSEC Projects for the evaluation from a list provided by the ENVSEC Secretariat. Each of the projects should be from different regions and executed by different lead organisations. The Ministry will have to approve the project selection.
- Collection and analysis of relevant documentation for ENVSEC as a whole and the projects selected for the evaluation.
- Elaboration of a discussion guide / checklist with key questions for interviews with ENVSEC agencies, stakeholders, beneficiaries and other donors in order to ensure a harmonised approach;
- Preparation of a visit plan; the exact agenda of the visits should be agreed with the project managers, the relevant ENVSEC agencies, national/regional project partners and other stakeholders.

II. Field

- Visits, interviews, and meetings in the regions of ENVSEC operations with:
 - ENVSEC Secretariat, Office of the Senior Manager in Geneva
 - ENVSEC Regional Desk Officers and managers of the projects selected for the evaluation;
 - ENVSEC partners in the field offices;
 - Major government stakeholders (e.g. Ministries of the Environment, others), civil society representatives and other relevant stakeholders;
 - Local and community authorities, where relevant.
 - Key donor representatives

- De-briefing in each of the regions

2.4 Required outputs

The following documents constitute the outputs of the assignment. They will be approved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. The outputs according to each phase are listed below:

I. Desk Phase (In Helsinki/Geneva)

- An inception note (confirming the proposed workplan and the methodological approach).
- Discussion guide on key evaluation questions
- Agenda of meetings and field visits to be used during the field phase.

II. Field phase (locations to be confirmed)

- Evaluation Report
- Annexes

The evaluation report will summarise the outcomes of the assignment according to the standard table of contents of the evaluation report (MFA guidelines). The evaluation report should also include:

- suggestions for corrective follow up and measures, if necessary, in order to consolidate ENVSEC achievements and improve the ongoing project operations;
- recommendations for future actions on the part of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland in the field of environment and security in the pan-European region, notably in the light of the second phase of assistance to ENVSEC in 2011-2013.

The report should include a summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations, preferably in a form of a chart/table. The final report will be submitted for approval one week after the draft report.

3. Expert profile

At least two experts are requested to carry out this assignment. The tasks should be divided between the experts in a time and cost efficient way. The experts will be responsible for the overall planning, implementation and reporting (preparation, finalisation, presentation and timely delivery). They will use their own computers.

Qualifications and Skills

- In-depth experience in managing/monitoring/reviewing similar projects in other countries;
- Experience in/familiarity with development cooperation activities in the area of monitoring and reporting MDG achievement in the countries of the region would be desirable, as well as knowledge of the local context (i.e. being well aware of the economic and political situation in the post-Soviet countries);
- Good knowledge and understanding of the subject matter of the evaluation (environment and security issues)
- Good knowledge and understanding of project evaluation methodology;
- Practical work experience with or within the United Nations system or international development organizations in countries with transitional economies is an asset;

- The position requires good communication skills and excellent drafting skills in English.
- Working knowledge of Russian is required from the expert conducting the field phase
- Strong PC and IT communications skills

4. Duration

The starting date of the assignment is 13th of September 2010. The maximum duration for the assignment is 30 days.

Phase activity	Month	Working days
Desk research	September	
Briefing with Ministry of Foreign Affairs and ENVSEC	September	1
Collection of data and documentation	September	2
Elaboration of discussion guide	September	1
Preparation of meeting agenda	September	1
Preparation of workplan	September	1
Field phase	September-October	
Visits and meetings in the field	September - October	15
Elaboration of mission report	October	2
Elaboration of the results	October	1
Evaluation of the draft report	October	1
Debriefing Geneva-Helsinki	October	2
Elaboration of the first draft report	October	1
Elaboration and submission of final report to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland	October	1
Presentation	October	1
Total days		30

Administrative information

- International travel to Geneva Helsinki
- International travel to ENVSEC project regions
- Per diem in Helsinki-Geneva
- Per diem in pan European region
- Local travel provision
- Other services (visas, airport taxes, insurance etc)
- If modifications to the budget agreed at contract signature are required, these must be discussed and agreed by the contracting part

Reporting

- 3 copies of the final report including annexes in hard copies and electronic versions
- The final report and other outputs should be prepared in English and should be usable for publication
- The final report will be submitted for approval one week after the draft report
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland reserves the right to request additional information or revision of the report to reach an appropriate outcome

5. Mandate

The evaluation team is entitled and expected to discuss matters relevant to this evaluation with pertinent persons and organizations. However, it is not authorized to make any commitments on the behalf of the Government of Finland.

6. Authorisation

Date and time

Signatories

Annex 3. People consulted (interviewees)

Enhancing National Capacity on Fire Management and Wildfire Disaster Risk Reduction in the South Caucasus

- Mr. Imran Abduloc, Deputy Head, Department of Environmental Policy and Environmental Protection, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Azerbaijan.
- Ms. Anna-Maria Adamia, Head, Division of International Relations, Forestry Agency, Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural resources of Georgia.
- Mr. Esa Ahlberg, Senior Short-term Expert, Support to the Strengthening of the Twinning in Georgia.
- Ms. Matanat Avazova, Deputy Director, Environmental National Monitoring Department, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Azerbaijan.
- Ms. Esra Buttanri, Environmental Affairs Advisor, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, OSCE.
- Ms. Nino Gokhelasvili, Head, Department of International Relations, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Georgia.
- Mr. Johann G. Goldammer, Coordinator, The Global Fire Monitoring Center (GFMC), Germany.
- Mr. Karen Hovhannisyan, Deputy Head, Management of Protection of the Population and Territory. Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Armenia.
- Mr. Irakli Kadagidze, Department Director, Emergency Management Department, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia.
- Mr. Rovshan Kazimov, Second Secretary, Division of UN and Global Economic Organizations, Department of Economic Cooperation and Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan.
- Ms. Nino Malashkhia, Coordinator, Environment and Security Initiative, OSCE, Georgia.
- Mr. Giorgi Mandaria, Deputy Head, Emergency Situations Management Department, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia.
- Mr. Shovgi Mehdizade Kamal oglu, Councillor, Embassy to Georgia, Republic of Azerbaijan.
- Mr. Michal Nekvasil, Second Secretary, Delegation of the European Commission to Georgia.
- Mr. Jan Ohlsson, Head, Economic And Environmental Unit, OSCE Office in Baku.
- Mr. Revaz Sakvarelidze, Second Secretary, UN division, Department of International Organisations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Georgia.
- Mr. Frits Schlingemann, Senior Advisor, UNEP.

- Mr. Otto Simonett, Director, Zoi Environment Network.
- Mr. Zurab Talakvadze, Deputy Head, State Fire Fighting Division, Department of the Emergency Situations Management, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia.
- Ms. Nouneh Zastoukhova, First Secretary, International Organisations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia.

Dam safety in Central Asia: Capacity building for regional cooperation

- Mr. Iskander Abdullaev, GTZ water management regional advisor, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Zhanat Alyakhassov, deputy director. Executive Board of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea in the Republic of Kazakhstan.
- Mr. Kurbangeldy Ballyev (national project coordinator for Turkmenistan) Representative of Turkmenistan in the Executive Committee of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea
- Mr. Nikolai Dimitriev, Kazhydroproekt (Design Institute for Hydroamelioration). Kazakhshtan.
- Mr Saghit Ibatullin, Ph.D. Prof, Chairman of Executive Committee for the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea, EC-IFAS.
- Mr. Hairullo Ibodzoda, , Representative of the Republic of Tajikistan in the Executive Committee of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea
- Ms. Madina Ibrasheva, OSCE. National Economic and Environmental Officer (The OSCE Centre in Astana, Liaison Office in Almaty)
- Mr. Zofar Irisboev, chief specialist, State Inspection on control and supervision for technical state and safety of operation of hydro-technical structures, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Tmur Kamalov, director (national project coordinator for Uzbekistan) State Inspection on control and supervision for technical state and safety of operation of hydro-technical structures, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Mavlon Kazakov, Representative of the Republic of Tajikistan in the Executive Committee of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea
- Mr. Amirkhan Kenshimov, UNDP, national project manager (former deputy chair of the Water Committee, Kazakhstan).
- Deputy Minister Shavkat Khamrayev, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Bo Libert, project coordinator. Regional Adviser on Environment Environment, Housing and Land Management Division, UN Economic Commission for Europe
- Mr. Martin Lindenlaub, CAREC (the Regional Environmental Centre for Central Asia). Kazakhstan.
- Mr. Ari Mäkelä, senior researcher, SYKE. Finnish Environment Institute.

- Ms. Delphine Marie, Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Kazakhstan. Project Manager.
- Mr. Mirfaizi Mirkkhodjaev, head of diagnostic center, State Inspection on control and supervision for technical state and safety of operation of hydro-technical structures, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Aleksandr Nikolayenko, GTZ, transboundary water management program in CA. Policy Dialogue, Sustainability and Environment, regional advisor. Kazakhstan.
- Mr. Petrov Georgy Niloaevich, Asian Development bank (ADB) Regional technical assistance. Deputy Team leader/flood management specialist. Kazakhstan
- Mr. Medet Ospanov, director (national project coordinator for Kazakhstan). Executive Board of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea in the Republic of Kazakhstan.
- Mr. Shavkat Rakhmatullaev, GTZ national water management specialist, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Ajiniyaz Reimov (Mr.), Programme Manager for ENVSEC, UNDP, Europe and the CIS, Bratislava Regional Centre RDO, UNDP Bratislava
- Mr. Tulegen Sarsembekov, Eurasian Development Bank (former Minister of Water in Kazakhstan)
- Ms. Aiman Smagulova, OSCE. Project Assistant, Economic and Environment Dimension
- Mr. Shukhrat Talipov, chief specialist, State Inspection on control and supervision for technical state and safety of operation of hydro-technical structures, Uzbekistan
- Mr. J. Michale Trainior, USAID, Senior Energy Policy Specialist (Office of Economic Growth, Kazakhstan).
- Mr. Valts Vilnitis, international expert seconded by EC to support on preparation of the BSAP 2011-2015. Kazakhstan
- Ms. Saija Vuola, Finnish Water Forum (former ENVSEC project manager UNDP, Almaty/Astana 2007-2009)
- Mr. Sergey Yelkin, USAID, Energy project Coordinator (Office of Economic Growth, Kazakhstan).

Transboundary cooperation and sustainable management in the Dniester river basin, phase 3

- Mr Lazar Chirica , Vice Minister of the Environment, Moldova
- Mrs Tamara Guvir, Head of the Department of Pollution Prevention, MoE Moldova
- Mr Mihail Penkov, Vice-President of Apele Moldovei - the water authorities under Ministry of Environment
- Mr Victor Bujac, Apele Moldovei
- Mr Ruslan Melian Water Research Institute, MoE, Moldova

- Mr Ilia Anton, Moldovan Research-Applied Centre for Preventive Medicine
- Mr Iuri Ursu, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Republic of Moldova, Fisheries Service
- Mr Ilya Trombitski, Executive Director, International Environmental Association of River Keepers “Eco-Tiras”
- Mrs Tatiana Siniaeva Project Coordinator Eco-TIRAS
- Mr Ivan Ignatyev, Prseident, Ecospectrum , Transdnjestre
- Mrs Yelena Shvalova Odessa Oblast Sanitary-Epidemiological Service
- Mrs Svetlana Slesarenok Director, Ukrainian National Environmental NGO “Mama-86”
- Mr Mykola Babich Deputy Head of national water authorities
- Mrs Olga Lysyuk, State Committee of Ukraine for water management
- Mrs Natalia Zakorchevna project co-ordinator, former head of the Water Dept. in MoE, Ukraine
- Mr Grigoriy Petruk Head of the Water Dept.,MoE, Ukraine
- Mrs Larysa Yurchak Deputy Head of the Water Resources protection Department, MoE, Ukraine
- Lubomir Kopaj, Ambassador OSCE Project Coordinator in Ukraine
- Yaroslav Yurtsaba, National Project Manager, OSCE mission to Ukraine
- Ms Tamara Kutonova Office of the Co-ordinator for OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, Ukraine
- Kenneth Pickles OSCE Mission to Moldova Politico-military Officer
- Bo Libert, UNECE, Geneva
- Nickolai Denisov, ZOI, Geneva Switzerland
- Karima Jambulatova, Geneva Call, Programme officer, NGO for demining
- Mehmet Balci, Geneva Call, Programme director, NGO for demining

ENVSEC Initiative Secretariat

- Mr. Christophe Bouvier, Director, Regional Office for Europe, United Nations Environment Programme.
- Mr. Nikolai Denisov, Coordinator, ZOI Environment Network/United Nations Environment Programme.
- Mr. Marco Keiner, Director, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.
- Bo Libert, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.
- Ms. Gordana Kozuharova, Director, Regional Environment Centre.
- Ms. Marika Palosaari, Programme Officer, ENVSEC Secretariat.

- Ms. Laura Rio, Senior Programme Officer, ENVSEC Secretariat.
- Mr. Marc Baltes, Deputy Coordinator, Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities, OSCE Secretariat, Vienna.

Regional Cities: Environmental Assessment and Capacity Building in Tbilisi

- Ms. Tamar Chachua, Adviser of Department of Ecology and Greenery Planting, Tbilisi, Georgia.
- Mr. Kukuri Goginashvili the head of Ecology Division of Department of Ecology and Greenery Planting, Tbilisi, Georgia.
- Mr. Zurab Jincharadze, Consultant, ZOI Environment Network, Georgia.
- Mr. Gigori Korkashvili, Head, Department of Ecology and Greenery Planting, Tbilisi, Georgia.
- Ms. Nora Mzavanadze, International Consultant of the GEO-City Project

Annex 4. Evaluation criteria and long-list of evaluation questions

Criterion	Description of criteria and ENVSEC evaluation specific evaluation questions/tasks
Relevance	<p><u>Description</u> Relevance relates to problems and needs, and concerns whether the results, purpose and overall objectives of the intervention are in line with the needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries, and with the policy environment of the intervention.</p> <p><i>Tasks and key evaluation questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Origin, history of the particular project being evaluated. How much can you tell, how/if where local partners/beneficiaries involved in project design, is this a follow-up of a local, national or regional initiative? • Are the overall objectives of the ENVSEC project in line with the needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries, target groups and key stakeholders /what are the national, local, or regional development priorities, does the ENVSEC project feature in national PRSPs, NAPAs etc? • Are the needs linked to environmental improvements and security threats in some manner (directly, indirectly – or maybe more on a conceptual level, or main objective to provide a channel for “peace/confidence-building dialogue”?), are the environment and security linkages evident in project design, key project documents (logframes, indicators...)? • Do you see any particular changes forthcoming in these particular areas in your country or region; are their importance and/or interlinkages increasing?
Efficiency	<p><u>Description</u> Efficiency relates to sound management and value for money, and the criterion is normally applied to planning and monitoring processes.</p> <p><i>Tasks and key evaluation questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of funds - how much was budgeted/used in overall? • Were the allocated budgets sufficient for the tasks, used in cost-efficient way, any major shortcomings (technical, financial..), were competitive bidding procedures followed when appropriate, local expertise used when possible/feasible? • Where the timelines followed? • Have the shares of responsibilities between project partners been clear, has communication been efficient and transparent? • To what extent does the present ENVSEC initiative secretariat and management structure create efficiency and benefits project management, implementation, and monitoring? If problems came up did the organization have capacity to react flexibly, with sufficient expertise? • Is the quality of reporting and monitoring and follow up by ENVSEC partners (implementers) adequate. • How is the monitoring of progress in practice done, by whom (who approves progress reports, what is the process like) and based on which indicators (are projects systematically checked against the WEI project document stated outcomes and performance indicators) • Any external audits, evaluations already done on this project, if yes, to what extent have the recommendations been adopted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any systematic way of learning lessons, collecting and disseminating these, within project, region, ENVSEC?
Effectiveness	<p><u>Description</u> Effectiveness relates to the achievement of purpose, and therefore how well the results have furthered progress towards achieving aims (the stated intervention purpose)</p> <p><i>Tasks and key evaluation questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well has the project achieved the objectives set out in the project documents (how clear, concrete are the objectives in your view: “to contribute to the reduction of environment and security risks, and to the increased cooperation both between and within countries”)? Any major difference between planned and implemented activities and outcomes (WEI overall Indicator: Extent to which environmental risks to security are acknowledged and mitigated by the recipient countries) Have the right (and appropriate level of) stakeholders been involved, and been motivated to work for the set objectives? Is the project/intervention the best way/tool to reach the overall target set, would there be any other ways that the beneficiaries would have preferred, is this intervention part of a wider package...? Any specific synergies within project components...and with other projects in the area, and/or other ENVSEC regions? Has there been value-added in the projects from implementation within the ENVSEC initiative, if yes, what has that value added been?
Impact	<p><u>Description</u> Impact relates to wider effects, and therefore the extent to which living conditions of targeted beneficiaries have improved as a direct or indirect result of the intervention.</p> <p><i>Tasks and key evaluation questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the project contributed to achieving the overall goal of the initiative (“The overall goal of the project is to assist the target countries in addressing environment and security risks and promoting environmental protection and transboundary cooperation”)? What changes has the project induced and what have been the overall effects of the project (direct, indirect, positive or negative, intended, or unintended) – environmentally, security, institutionally, financially,....? Has there been increased dialogue and communication, confidence building? Has any dialogue that would otherwise been difficult, hampered, stopped, maybe continued thanks to this project? Would the dialogue around the project have been catalyzed anyway due to other forces (e.g. EU relations, etc)? Can the performance indicators from prodocs be verified and provide evidence for the impacts? (how much portals used, communication and dialogue increased, on which topics in particular...)? Examples of success stories, cases for learning lessons? – what were the main reasons for these successes (or any failures)? Did the project enhance any “system-wide approaches” or so called integrated approaches or ecosystem approaches, how well understood, analyzed potential interlinkages between trade, energy, agriculture, water resources? What would be situation without the project – what has been the value added of the ENVSEC Initiative in this particular project? Where any particular risks realized, problems encountered that reduced efficiency, effectiveness and final impact?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project address any particular cross-cutting issues: civil society strengthening (which is an overall goal of the ENVSEC Initiative), gender and social equality are cross-cutting priorities of the ENVSEC programme? (there should be mainstreaming in all phases of project cycle, training to project managers + gender checklist available, and Management Board reviews each project for gender too) • Overall what has been the number of beneficiaries, give some examples, who are they, any NGOs involved....?
Sustainability	<p><u>Description</u></p> <p>Sustainability relates to the likely continuation of results achieved by the intervention after it ends.</p> <p><i>Tasks and key evaluation questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the changes been sustainable? • What are the key determinants of whether or not the ENVSEC intervention has sustainable impacts (what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability of project outcomes, such as: financial and economic support, organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector, policies and regulatory frameworks, institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc...), identifying and involving champions (i.e. individuals in government or civil society who can take the lead in securing sustainability of program outcomes), social sustainability – any additional funding leveraged thanks to the ENVSEC project? • How are the different aspects of sustainability (economic, social, institutional, environmental...) treated in project documents, in project design - have they all been covered – and actual implementation? • Any additional funding leveraged/catalyzed thanks to this ENVSEC project? • What about resilience to climate change, any other major threats emerging? • What have the beneficiaries stated, how pleased are they with the results, ready for handover (who are they – the same as foreseen in project initiation?, how, when did they express themselves)? • Are the local partners ready for handover, have they taken over already some tasks, will they have the capacity (financial, institutional and political support/will) to follow-up?

Annex 5. Summary table of the evaluation of the ENVSEC Projects

The table below summarizes the overall scores for the evaluated three ENVSEC interventions, in line with the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.. It should be noted that no meta-conclusions can be drawn on the broader ENVSEC portfolio as such based on this limited sample of projects. However, the evaluation exercise allows identifying success stories, lessons learned and suggests recommendations for further improvements.

Table.5.1. Summary table of the evaluation results for the three selected projects.

Evaluation Criterion	Fire Management in the South Caucasus	Transboundary cooperation Dniester river basin	Dam Safety in Central Asia
Relevance	high	high	very high
Efficiency	medium/high	medium/high	high
Effectiveness	medium	medium/high	medium
Impacts	medium/high	medium/high	medium/high
Sustainability	medium	medium	medium/high

Scoring legend: very low – low – medium – high – very high