

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

**EXTERNAL MID-TERM REVIEW
Annexes**

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

April, 25th, 2008

Annex 1 - TORs

THE PROPOSAL

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

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

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

HKKH partnership background

The regional Project “Institutional Consolidation for the Coordinated and Integrated Monitoring of Natural Resources towards Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation in the Hindu Kush-Karakoram-Himalaya Mountain Complex” is a partnership initiative developed in the framework of the priorities defined in the WSSD Draft Plan of Implementation and considering the recommendations made for achieving successful implementation -1.157 TD [(i)3(m)-aluW(nab)-12(IO12(ef)-13(i)3(n-12(IDeeuTJ 0 Tc 0 Tw 1)-12(i)3(nhe pr)-6(ir2(ef)-13(i)3(n-

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

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

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose of the evaluation

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

1. Rationale of the revised strategic and methodological approaches of the Project (revised from the original project document) and its effects on stakeholder acceptance, and its medium and long-term prospects
2. Project Performance:
 - a. Progress registered during the first half of the Project
 - b. Partners performance in delivering outputs

Final output report

The final report

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

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

3. Performance rating

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

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

4. Methodology

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

- pos18Li-14.699.ody 69equ03K(L)2Cy15(R2(y))ngd C15(E(qu03S)12V(2-li)-9 -9(on n3(e)-1-15-32(l)-l2)]TT)-1obe

	Hunza Karimabad	Field visit to Hunza Valley		
--	--------------------	-----------------------------	--	--

Annex 5

List of partners institutions

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