

**REPORT ON TERMINAL EVALUATION  
of the Project “Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and  
Responsible Attitude to Environment”**

**Prepared by Nana Gibradze, Evaluation Team Leader and  
Kate Skhireli, Evaluation Team Member  
on behalf of UNDP Georgia**

**September 2015 - October 2015**

The Final Evaluation of the UNDP Project “**Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment**” was carried out from September – October 2015 by the Team of independent consultants Nana Gibradze and Kate Skhireli. The Evaluation was commissioned by the UNDP Country Office in Georgia.

The Evaluation was conducted in Georgia and involved Project beneficiaries and stakeholders based in Tbilisi, Borjomi, Tsagveri, Daba, Timotesubani, Mzetamze and Akhaltsikhe.

The Terminal Evaluation Team would like to express gratitude to all interviewed persons for their time and consideration, also for their qualified and honest opinions. The Team is grateful to all respondents from Tbilisi, Borjomi, Tsagveri, Daba, Timotesubani, Mzetamze and Akhaltsikhe for their time and availability for interviews, as well as valuable information provided to the evaluators. The Team is particularly grateful to the former Ambassador of Finland to Georgia, H. E. Mr. Petri Salo and the acting Ambassador of Finland to Georgia, H. E. Mr. Christer Michelsson, for their availability for interviews.

The Terminal Evaluation Team is grateful to Ms. Asmat Lali Meskhi, Project Manager, Ms. Ketevan Ann Cheishvili, Admin/Finance Assistant and Ms. Nino Antadze, Environment Team Leader, for their continuous support and guidance throughout the consultancy. The Team is particularly grateful to Mr. Nugzar Donguzashvili, the Project driver, for his support and valuable inputs regarding Project implementation. The Terminal Evaluation Team would also like to thank Ms. Maka Gongadze, Head of the Rural Farmers’ Association “Green Valley” and Mr. Alexander Zarnadze, Manager of Rural Farmers’ Association “Green Valley” for accompanying the Team during the field visits and organizing the fruitful encounters with the beneficiaries and stakeholders.

The evaluators express their particular appreciation to the representatives of current and former senior management of UNDP Georgia: Mr. Shombi Sharp, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative, Ms. Natia Natsvlishvili, Assistant Resident Representative and Ms. Sophia Kemkhadze, former Assistant Resident Representative, who kindly contributed their inputs and opinions about the Project.

Except for the opinions of the respondents consolidated in Chapter 6. *Findings*, all opinions expressed in this report are those of the Evaluators and do not represent the official views of UNDP Georgia or any stakeholder involved in the Project.

## Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	5
CHAPTER 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	6
CHAPTER 2. INTRODUCTION .....	10
CHAPTER 3. INTERVENTION DESCRIPTION .....	12
CHAPTER 4. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES .....	18
CHAPTER 5. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS .....	21
<i>Basic Statistics</i> .....	21
<i>Data Collection Procedures and Instruments</i> .....	22

Given the characteristics of the sample, the Evaluation applied predominantly *qualitative* data collection methodology. The selection of a qualitative analysis method was determined by the *type* of the Evaluation, that is, *ex-post non-experimental process and results evaluation*. In those cases when the sample is not randomly selected, but pre-determined (purposive), quantitative methods are difficult to apply. Furthermore, quantitative methods are best suited for measuring levels and changes in impacts and for drawing inferences from observed statistical relations between those impacts and other covariates. They are less effective, however, in understanding *process*—that is, the mechanisms by which a particular intervention instigates a series of events that ultimately result in the observed impact<sup>1</sup>. The current Evaluation was a *process* (output) evaluation as it evaluated the delivery of results, effectiveness, efficiency, etc. rather than an outcome or impact. .... 22

Qualitative analysis centers on the understanding and observation without control and is considered subjective and descriptive. Despite the UNDP focus on the results, the qualitative analysis focuses mainly on the processes, is not generalizable and presents internal and external validity challenges. As compared with the quantitative approach, qualitative analysis seeks to gauge potential impacts that the project may generate, the mechanisms of such impacts, and the extent of benefits to recipients from individual and group-based interviews. Whereas quantitative results can be generalizable, the qualitative results may not be, especially with smaller samples. .... 23

Nonetheless, qualitative methods generate information that may be critical for understanding the mechanisms through which the program helps beneficiaries (World Bank Handbook on Impact Evaluation), allow more in-depth and subjective

---

<sup>1</sup> [Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Program Evaluation, \(with Michael Woolcock\), in Francois Bourgingnon and Luiz Pereira Da Silva \(edited\) Tool Kit for Evaluating the Poverty and Distributional Impact of Economic Policies, World Bank and Oxford University Press, 2003](#)

examination of complex cases, that are not easily examinable with quantitative research methods, and give more flexibility to investigation as it is not limited to rigid variables. Qualitative analysis, albeit non-generalizable, allows for better understanding the mechanisms through which the program helps beneficiaries<sup>2</sup>, and permits to work with issues related to “soft” and intangible products associated with processes, as well as perceptions related to knowledge and capacities. It allows evaluating potential impacts, generating critical information for the understanding of the problem and construction of the intervention, providing in-depth analysis of complex cases, which are difficult to evaluate quantitatively. .... 23

Given the qualitative nature of the analysis, one of the main methodological challenges encountered by the Evaluation was obtaining *comparable primary data* to analyze the Project according to the evaluation criteria. .... 24

Another methodological challenge was related to a *varied understanding* of the concepts of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Some respondents did not have sufficient information to rate all criteria. On those occasions, where the respondents were unable to rate *all* criteria, the quantitative rating was not applied. .... 24

CHAPTER 6. FINDINGS .....	25
CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSIONS .....	39
CHAPTER 8. LESSONS LEARNED .....	41
CHAPTER 9. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	42
LIST OF ANNEXES.....	44

<sup>2</sup> [World Bank Handbook on Impact Evaluation, Quantitative Methods and Practices, Khandker, Shahidur, Koolwal, Gayatri, Samad, Hussain, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2010](#)

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CENN	Caucasus Environmental NGO Network
COA	Chart of Accounts
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ENPARD	European Neighborhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GEL	Georgian Lari
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
LELP	Legal Entity of Public Law
MENR	Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources
MENRP	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resource Protection
MoEP	Ministry of Environment Protection
PEB	Project Executive Board
PMU	Project Management Unit
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

## CHAPTER 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Terminal Evaluation of the Project “*Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*” (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”), commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office in Georgia, was carried out from September – October 2015 by a team of independent consultants, Ms. Nana Gibradze and Ms. Kate Skhireli. The *timing* of the Evaluation is due to the anticipated completion of the Project in December 2015.

The *general objective* of the Evaluation is to identify the outputs produced by the Project, its contributions to outcome level results, positive and/or negative changes produced, including possible unplanned results, key lessons learned, limitations and strengths. The *purpose* of the Evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the ongoing Project and to evaluate the results and potential impacts, relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability; to suggest recommendations for replication of the project successes; and, to document and provide feedback on lessons learned.

The primary *users* of the Evaluation results are UNDP Georgia and the Government of Finland. The results and the lessons learned from the Evaluation will be shared, *as necessary*, with the key Project stakeholders, including the Government of Georgia through the Ministries of Environment Protection and Natural Resources Protection and of Science and Education; Borjomi and Tsagveri municipalities and community organizations; National and international non-governmental organizations; and, private sector.

The *subject* of the Evaluation is the UNDP Project “*Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*” in its entirety, which is currently in the last stage of implementation. The Project is the second phase of an earlier UNDP intervention aimed at restoring the forest in Borjomi Gorge, damaged in 2008 during the war with Russia; the first phase of this intervention was implemented from 2010-2012. The Project, carried out in Tbilisi, Borjomi and Tsagveri municipalities from 2012-2015, directly benefitted 669 households comprising 2,044 persons, more than 700 school children engaged in environmental activities; and, institutions in Borjomi and Tsagveri municipalities.

The Project was funded by the Government of Finland, which allocated EURO 1,179,677 (US\$ 1,505,593). The Project also obtained co-financing and parallel financing of GEL 1,146,111 from beneficiaries and stakeholders and in-kind contributions in the form of office space and premises, staff time, transportation, infrastructure rehabilitation costs and the like.

The Project was *directly implemented* (DIM) by the UNDP Country Office Georgia in partnership with the Ministry of Environment Protection as the responsible party. Implementing partners included national and international non-governmental organizations and companies and Legal Entities of Public Law of Georgia. The Project was *managed* by a three-person Project Management Unit and governed by the Project Executive Board, comprised of the representatives of UNDP, Georgian and Finnish Governments.

The *non-experimental summative output (process) evaluation* was predominantly qualitative and was implemented with a purposive sample, consisting of 3 categories: Headquarters/Project Management, Country Stakeholders, and Regional Partners. The quantitative analysis method consisted in rating the Project along the four evaluation criteria on the scale from 1-5. The share of quantitative data in the final analysis is approximately 10%.

The Evaluation interviewed 68 respondents, carried out 22 individual and 11 group (1-3 persons) interviews and 3 focus group meetings. The Evaluation reviewed more than 70 documents and reference materials and conducted field visits to five Project sites. The evaluation encountered *methodological* challenges, such as the *quality of comparable primary data* and *the difference in the size of the categories within the sample*. *Non-methodological* challenges were related to the *limited availability/non-responsiveness of some respondents* and *varied understanding of the evaluation criteria by the stakeholders*. Non-methodological challenges were minor and were related to the format of indicators, baselines and targets and lack of knowledge of the entire Project by some stakeholders.

The Project Results and Resources Framework stipulates 5 *expected outputs*: Livelihoods of local people in the villages adjacent to the affected forest areas become more sustainable; Disaster resilience of target villages is increased through risk reduction measures; Informal environmental education at secondary schools introduced; Responsible attitude to environment grows in target area Public awareness on and sound management of natural resources is increased; and, Project Management.

The Project was aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2008-2011: Environment and Strategic Development and with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Outcome 3: *A culture of safety and resilience is built at all levels using knowledge, innovation, and education*. The expected outputs of the Project contribute to the achievement of the Expected UNDP Country Programme Outcome: *Underlying disaster risk factors are reduced, focusing on sustainable environmental and natural resource management*; and Expected Country Programme Output: *Sustainable practices and instruments for the management of natural resources, including land, water and biological resources demonstrated at pilot areas and up scaled at national and trans boundary levels*. At the national level, the Project was guided by the draft *Law on Forests*<sup>3</sup> (Forestry Code), *Law on Environmental Protection* and its amendments and the strategy of the Government of Georgia: *“Environmental Education for Sustainable Development”*.

The overall rating of the Project by the stakeholders was 4.9 on the scale of 1-5. The highest ratings were received for *relevance* (4.9 out of 5), especially the adequacy and importance of the local and national level interventions, alignment with the national and corporate priorities and appropriateness of its interventions. *Effectiveness* was rated 4.8, despite the *exogenous* (strong initial resistance due to political and institutional context and weak capacities) challenges that affected the implementation. Despite these challenges, the Project has achieved 99% of the planned output results, has contributed to positive outcome-level changes, has forged successful partnerships and has obtained positive unplanned results. The Project has been considered *innovative* given the rigorous

<sup>3</sup> Draft, pending approval by the Parliament of Georgia.

scientific approach and experimental methods *and catalytic* for triggering a series of processes locally and nationally, expected to have a significant impact, such as farmers' cooperatives, environmental education, through youth eco-clubs, knowledge products and processes and public awareness interventions. The Project has successfully engaged vulnerable segments of the population: youth, women, and IDPs.

The Project received high ratings (4.8) for *efficiency*, given the achieved results, efficient use of resources, resulting in significant savings, successful mobilization of parallel financing and the potential impact it helped generate. Despite the fact, that the rating of the Project *sustainability* was the lowest of the four criteria (4.3), the Project has been considered largely sustainable, especially taking into account the pilot nature of the intervention, limited implementation timeframe and existing obstacles and limitations. Outputs results 1, 2 and 3 demonstrated the highest prospects of sustainability and future impact. Challenges related to sustainability are linked to the overall low level of environmental awareness and education in the region and overall in Georgia, where sustainable environmental management is still considered a secondary priority.

The Evaluation has identified positive and negative contributing factors, which influenced the achievement of the Project results and may affect the long-term sustainability of the Project results. The *positive* factors included the strong project management and leadership, participatory and consultative nature of the Project, flexibility and leadership of the UNDP Country Office management and the donor Government, engagement of stakeholders and beneficiaries, and an effective communications and public outreach campaign. The *negative* factors were mostly of exogenous nature and included overall institutional weaknesses and deficient legal frameworks, initial resistance from the Government and beneficiaries, limited qualified human resources and very low civic culture and environmental awareness among the population.

Based on the analysis and triangulation of the Evaluation findings and in light of the complex political and legal settings, institutional shortcomings and initial local resistance, the Evaluation concluded that the UNDP Project - *Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment* – has been *successfully implemented and has achieved notable results with significant potential impact*. The Evaluation concludes that, considering the low initial baseline and the relatively short duration (3 years), the Project has achieved remarkable *positive and tangible change*, which is observable and largely measurable.

The Evaluation concluded that given its social nature, linkages between environment and social vulnerability and the emphasis on improving livelihoods through sustainable management of environment, the systemic and multi-disciplinary approach to complex development challenges and its experimental and scientific character, the Project has been highly relevant for the country, for UNDP and the UN system at large.

The Evaluation considers that the Project has achieved high *effectiveness and efficiency* in the delivery of expected results, has exceeded the initial expectations and has obtained unplanned results with utmost efficiency and prudent use of available resources. UNDP has succeeded in transforming a problematic initiative on the verge of failure into an innovative and replicable pilot with significant potential impact and far-reaching results.



The Evaluation concludes that the Project has achieved *reasonable sustainability of the results*, with some components (forestry, sustainable farming, eco-clubs and informal environmental education) having higher sustainability prospects than others (energy-efficiency, tourist trails).

In general, the Evaluation considers that given the 3-year timeframe of the Project, its pilot nature and extremely low level of civism and environmental awareness in the target areas, it would have been *unrealistic* to expect high sustainability of results. Instead, the Evaluation concludes that the Project has provided the beneficiaries with important *mechanisms for sustainability*, established resources, infrastructure, database and basic capacities to be used for future similar interventions in the region and has generated a body of scientific and practical knowledge that should be made available for wide use.

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has created a *solid base for replication* for UNDP proper as well as for national and international stakeholders. The Project has created a multi-component model that can be adapted and replicated in similar environments.

The Evaluation commends the UNDP Country Office and the Government of Finland for the strategic vision when changing the logic of intervention and opting for the one most likely to generate *significant impact*. The Evaluation concludes that out of the two phases of the Borjomi Initiative, the *current Project has been more strategic, innovative and sustainable in long-term*. The Evaluation considers that the only missing element that would have further enhanced the sustainability and the impact of the current Project was the *policy component* that would have targeted institutional deficiencies and barriers.

The Evaluation, therefore, concludes that the *most significant advance towards potential impact* was made through instigating awareness about the environment as an essential premise of human wellbeing and by piloting sustainable livelihoods models. The Project has succeeded in planting seeds of awareness and responsibility among the next generations, which is expected to adopt a more responsible attitude towards the environment and sustainable development in general. The Project has laid foundations for changing perceptions and behaviors and contributed to the enhancement of educational systems, as prerequisites for responsible attitude to the environment. The Project has also created the opportunities for employment and offered tools for increasing self-sufficiency and resilience. These elements are most likely to generate most sustainable and long-term future impact.

The Evaluation identified a series of *lessons learned* related to institutional challenges in countries with fragile public administration systems, low level of public engagement and civism, low environmental awareness and human resource capacities, including the communities, civil servants, and media.

The Evaluation has formulated a series of *recommendations* regarding the potential niches of UNDP involvement and for improving design, implementation, and sustainability of future interventions:

The Evaluation considers that UNDP Georgia can further increase the *relevance* of its interventions by testing and promoting innovative approaches that can have high social and economic impact. To increase the *effectiveness and sustainability* of similar

interventions, the Evaluation strongly suggests the inclusion of policy components, fostering stronger ties with line ministries and enhancing the visibility of key protagonists to promote national ownership of the results. The Evaluation recommends the inclusion of capacity development and awareness raising activities for national stakeholders, such as line ministries and departments and municipal authorities and the media.

For increased *effectiveness* of interventions related to agriculture, the Evaluation recommends further provision of technical assistance to link the beneficiaries with relevant national structures and potential financial sources and continuous strengthening of organizational capacities of beneficiary organizations. As a measure of future *efficiency and sustainability*, the Evaluation recommends using the trained beneficiaries as the human resource base for multidisciplinary programmes and projects of regional scope. Likewise, in order to increase *efficiency and effectiveness* of future similar interventions, the Evaluation recommends *increasing the involvement of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT)* in comprehensive multi-disciplinary interventions of this type.

To increase the *effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability* of the results, the Evaluation recommends considering the inclusion of Project in the review of Environment and Energy Portfolio as part of the CPAP review (if carried out) or through monitoring of other projects of the Environment and Energy Team. As a way of fostering the *relevance and effectiveness* of UNDP work, the Evaluation highly recommends systematization of the successful experiences and vast technical and methodological knowledge generated by the Project in a form of a guide-book or a case study for dissemination to stakeholders and bemused for future *resource mobilization and replication*.

Finally, to improve the *effectiveness* of its work, the Evaluation recommends that UNDP improve the quality of project baselines, indicators and targets for more effective monitoring and measurement of change towards the results. The Evaluation also suggests using diverse sources for obtaining necessary baselines and targets, such as opinion surveys, statistical data, own assessments, and reports.

## CHAPTER 2. INTRODUCTION

### *Purpose and Timing of the Evaluation*

The Terminal Evaluation of the Project “*Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*” (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”) was carried out from September – October 2015 by a team of independent consultants, Ms. Nana Gibradze, and Ms. Kate Skhireli. It was commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office in Georgia.

The *timing* of the Evaluation is due to the anticipated completion of the Project in December 2015. The *general objective* of the Evaluation is to identify the outputs produced by the Project, its contributions to outcome level results, positive and/or negative changes produced, including possible unplanned results, key lessons learned, limitations and strengths.

The *purpose* of the Evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the ongoing Project by assessing the Project design, the

implementation process, the achievement of the Project objectives (including any changes in the objectives agreed during the Project implementation) and any other results. The Terminal Evaluation has three complementary purposes:

- To evaluate results and potential impacts, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability;
- To suggest recommendations for replication of the project successes;
- To document and provide feedback on lessons learned;

#### *Primary Audience of Evaluation*

The primary users of the Evaluation results are UNDP Georgia and the Government of Finland. The results and the lessons learned from the Evaluation will be shared, *as necessary*, with the key Project stakeholders, which include:

- Government of Georgia through the Ministries of Environment Protection and Natural Resources Protection and of Science and Education;
- Borjomi and Tsagveri Municipalities;
- National and international non-governmental organizations;
- Community organizations in Borjomi and Tsagveri Municipalities;
- Private sector.

In line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, the present Evaluation will contribute to general accountability, knowledge building, and organizational improvement by sharing the findings and lessons learned with all concerned stakeholders.

The final report of the Evaluation will serve as a learning document, which will help focus UNDP's work in the country and foster innovative mechanisms and policies to support sustainable development. Key conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned of the Evaluation will be used by the main parties to assess their approaches to development assistance at local and national levels and to design future interventions in the area of environmental protection and sustainable development, disaster risk reduction, sustainable livelihoods and gender mainstreaming.

#### *Structure and Contents of the Report*

The report largely follows the recommendations of the Evaluation Report Template of the *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*, with some modifications made to the structure to better reflect the logic of the analysis. The report contains nine chapters and seven annexes.

Chapter 1 offers the readers a 5-page executive summary of the Evaluation with the key findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 2 introduces the objective, the purpose and the timing of the Evaluation, describes its primary audience and outlines the structure and contents of the report.

Chapter 3 presents the basic background information about the Project, explains key Project objectives and expected results as stipulated in the Results and Resources Framework (RRF), links them with corporate priorities and strategic plans and outlines

the Project strategy. It also identifies the beneficiaries and strategic partners, describes the implementation arrangements and funding situation.

Chapter 4 explains what the Evaluation intends to achieve and how, pointing to the issues not covered by the Evaluation, defines its scope, objectives, criteria and type of generated information.

Chapter 5 describes selected methods of analysis and rationale for their selection, defines data sources, data collection procedures and methods, describes the sampling methods applied and identifies limitations of the selected methodology. The chapter also describes what type of data was collected, how this data was processed and identifies challenges of data analysis.

Chapter 6 offers the findings of the Evaluation based on the revision of the primary and secondary data. The chapter describes the achievement of the Project outputs in accordance with the RRF, Project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, south-south cooperation mechanisms and gender mainstreaming. It also describes the strengths and limitations of the Project, which have influenced the achievement of the outputs.

Chapter 7 consolidates the Evaluation conclusions drawn as a result of the analysis and triangulation of the findings, following the guiding questions of the Evaluation Terms of Reference.

Chapter 8 offers a brief list of lessons learned during the Evaluation.

Chapter 9 offers a list of recommendations for UNDP and key project stakeholders.

### **CHAPTER 3. INTERVENTION DESCRIPTION**

#### *Subject of Evaluation*

The subject of the Evaluation is the UNDP Project “*Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*”, which is currently in the last stage of implementation. The Project is the second phase of an earlier UNDP intervention aimed at restoring the forest in Borjomi Gorge, damaged in 2008 during the war with Russia; the first phase of this intervention was carried out from 2010-2012.

As stated in the Project title the overall objective of the Project is to promote sustainable livelihoods and responsible attitude to the environment through supporting income generation activities related to safe environment. This is to be achieved through piloting alternative energy systems and energy efficiency measures with selected local households, schools and municipal buildings; introducing informal environmental education through eco-clubs operating in local schools, eco camps and green schools; fostering community mobilization and strengthening local capacities to ensure local participation; enhancing ownership and knowledge of as well as commitment to environment and natural resources and supporting sustainable local development.

Within these objectives the expected output-level results of the Project are:

1. Expected Output 1 – Livelihoods of local people in the villages adjacent to the affected forest areas become more sustainable;

2. Expected Output 2: Disaster resilience of target villages is increased through risk reduction measures;
3. Expected Output 3: Informal environmental education at secondary schools introduced;
4. Expected Output 4: Responsible attitude to environment grows in target area Public awareness on and sound management of natural resources is increased.
5. Expected Output 5: Project Management

#### *Geographic Scope and Beneficiaries*

The Project interventions were carried out in Tbilisi, Borjomi and Tsagveri municipalities, covering villages Tsagveri, Daba, Timotesubani, and Mzetamze.

The immediate direct beneficiaries of the Project include local households in vulnerable communities (669 households comprising 2,044 persons<sup>4</sup>), more than 700 school children engaged in environmental activities; and, institutions in Borjomi and Tsagveri municipalities, which benefitted from pilot interventions. The indirect beneficiaries of the Project are teachers in national and local educational schools, which will receive the Teachers' Guidebook on Environmental Education; teachers, who are expected to receive credits for future engagement in eco-clubs; schoolchildren nationwide, who will benefit from informal environmental education through the Teachers' Guidebook on Environmental Education; families and acquaintances of the direct beneficiaries and communities at large which are expected to benefit from the increased environmental awareness, improved capacities and processes.

#### *Implementation Phases, Strategic Lines and Programmatic Linkages*

The current Project is the second phase of a UNDP-led initiative aimed at restoring the damaged forests of Borjomi after the military activities of summer 2008. The current Project was developed in consultation with the donor, the Government of Finland in order to refocus the activities of the initial phase, stalled as a result of the restructuring of the Georgian Government. As a result of these consultations, the Project was approved in April 2012 with a refocused Results and Resource Framework.

The first phase of the intervention - "*Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008*" started in April 2010 and was canceled in 2012. The current Project was approved in April 2012 and had the initial duration of 36 months. It was due to finish on 30 March 2015, however, as a result of a no-cost extension approved in September 2014, the Project is set to finish on 31 December 2015. The refocused Project aimed at supporting income generation activities related to safe environment; piloting alternative energy systems and energy efficiency measures to selected local families, schools and municipality buildings; introducing informal environmental education through eco-clubs, eco-camps and green schools; community mobilization and training to ensure local participation in all activities enhancing ownership, knowledge and natural resource management capacities.

---

<sup>4</sup> Village Mzetamze: 141 households – 394 persons; Daba: 70 households – 239 persons; Tsagveri: 369 households – 1,167 persons; and, Timotesubani: 89 households – 244 persons.

The Project objectives and outputs were aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2008-2011: Environment and Strategic Development and with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Outcome 3. The expected outputs of the Project contribute to the achievement of the Expected UNDP Country Programme Outcome: *Underlying disaster risk factors are reduced, focusing on sustainable environmental and natural resource management*; and Expected Country Programme Output: *Sustainable practices and instruments for the management of natural resources, including land, water and biological resources demonstrated at pilot areas and up scaled at national and trans boundary levels*. At the national level, the Project was guided by the draft *Law on Forests*<sup>5</sup> (Forestry Code), *Law on Environmental Protection* and its amendments and the strategy of the Government of Georgia: “*Environmental Education for Sustainable Development*”.

#### *Project Resources*

The Project was fully financed by the Government of Finland, which provided EURO 1,179,677 (US\$ 1,505,593)<sup>6</sup>. In addition to the allocated resources, the Project received in-kind and financial contributions from beneficiary communities and stakeholder institutions. The in-kind contributions included office space and premises, staff time, transportation, infrastructure rehabilitation costs and the like. The details on the co-financing obtained by the Project are described on pp. 5 and 31.

#### *Political and Institutional Context*

The Project “*Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*” focuses on sustainable livelihoods, responsible attitude to environment and disaster risk reduction in the areas affected by forest fires caused by bombing. It represents the second phase of an earlier initiative “*Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008*” initiated by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection to mitigate the major impacts of forest fires caused by the armed conflict. Both phases have been funded by the Government of Finland in response to Georgian Prime Minister’s appeal as part of the pledge for post-conflict reconstruction, made at the Donor Conference in Brussels in autumn of 2008.

The initial Project aimed at rehabilitating the most damaged area (about 70 ha) of the burned forest cover in Borjomi to mitigate the threat of floods, landslides, and mud slips. Additionally, the Project aimed at carrying out a baseline ecological study and monitoring of the recovery process, providing training and capacity building of national cadres. The Project has been refocused following the challenges, caused by the Government-led reforms in the environment sector in early 2011, which resulted in legislative and structural transformations, changes in the national priorities and national institutions and changing the status of the key partner organization.

---

<sup>5</sup> Draft, pending approval by the Parliament of Georgia.

<sup>6</sup> Based on EURO Dollar exchange rate of 1 US\$=0.819 EUR of June 2010 for the first tranche and 1 US\$=0.755 EUR of May 2012, for the second tranche.

Following the amendments to the “Law of Georgia on Structure, Proxy and Rule of Activity of the Government of Georgia” in early 2011, the main counterpart and responsible partner of the initial Project – Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection (MENRP) was restructured with some of its functions being transferred to the Ministries of Energy, Regional Development and of Agriculture. As a result of this reform, the function of natural resource management and licensing has been transferred to the newly restructured Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources (MENR), by ways of transferring the Agency for Natural Resources and Basic Sapling Forestry to the latter. The Forestry Authority, responsible for forest management, has been incorporated into the Agency for Natural Resources, under the MENR. Several leading scientific institutes, engaged in the research and assessments commissioned by the Project, including the Forestry Institute, were abolished and incorporated by the Agrarian University. As a result of these changes, the MENR replaced the MENRP as the main national counterpart of UNDP Georgia causing changes in the priorities of the national counterpart and subsequent delays and stagnation of implementation.

Faced with the threat of canceling the funding by the Finnish Government, UNDP, in consultation with the donor agreed to change the logic of the intervention and approved the new, refocused Project in its current form. In January 2012, the refocused Project was officially handed back to the restructured Ministry of Environment Protection (MoEP), which again became the main national counterpart of UNDP, albeit with a narrowed scope and functions.

The strategy of the refocused Project – *Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment* – focused on promoting sustainable livelihoods; increasing resilience against natural disasters; and, building responsible attitude to the environment in the target areas of Borjomi municipality. These were to be achieved through building capacity for sustainable use of natural resources; fostering disaster preparedness and risk reduction; increasing awareness and community ownership; supporting income generation activities related to safe environment; piloting alternative energy systems and energy efficiency measures to selected local families, schools, and municipality buildings; introducing informal environmental education through eco clubs, eco camps and green schools; community mobilization and training to ensure local participation in all activities enhancing ownership, knowledge and natural resource management capacities. The Project also addressed cross-cutting and special issues related to local participation, and vulnerable groups such as youth, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and women.

Since 2012 to-date, the Project Management has been cooperating with the Ministry of Environment Protection through the Forestry Agency and Basic Sapling Forestry entity, which have been re-incorporated into the structure of the Ministry.

#### *Project Design*

The Project Document is mostly well developed, contains most of the essential components required by UNDP and provides adequate background information and

contents. The Project does not have the Theory of Change<sup>7</sup>, however, the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) allows to understand the logic of intervention. The RRF has been amended following the substantive revision carried out in June 2012.

Four out of five outputs are formulated adequately and indicate the result expected upon their achievement. The fifth output lacks precision and definition of an expected result. The indicators used in the RRF are qualitative in nature, however, these are not specific, measurable and time-bound. Some indicators are formulated as activities or results. Baselines and targets are not specific and while mostly linked to indicators, do not allow measuring the level of change achieved by the Project. Many activities listed in the RRF resemble objectives and are not specific, however, these are spelled out in more detail in the Project document.

The Management Arrangements are well defined. The project document provides the general description of the structure and the functions of the Project Executive Board (PEB) and the Project Management Unit (PMU). The roles of the Executive, Senior User, Senior Supplier and Project Assurance are well defined and clear. The project document also clearly defines the administrative and communication procedures, coordination mechanisms with the donor and stakeholders.

The signed project document contains a monitoring and evaluation framework, a detailed component "*Quality Management for Project Activity Results*" and an offline risk log, which are well developed and detailed. The project document contains comprehensive situation analysis, which provides the full context of the intervention. The budget and the workplan provide the detailed breakdown of activities/costs per donor/implementing agency. The project document contains costing by cost category per Project Activity as stipulated in the RRF.

The Legal Framework component of the project document makes reference to the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) of Georgia as well as the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA). The project document stipulates safety and security provisions in accordance with the Article III of the SBAA.

The cost-sharing agreement signed in 2010 for the initial phase of the Project stipulates the total amount of the donor contribution, the schedule of payments, provisions for the utilization and administration of and reporting on the contribution, administrative and support services, evaluation and auditing of the Project, ownership of equipment, completion, amendment and termination of the agreement and other mandatory provisions. The amended cost-sharing agreement was signed on 4 September 2012 to reflect the changes related to the refocusing of the initial intervention such as the title of the new Project and changes in the schedule of payments. The no-cost extension of the Project till 31 December 2015 was approved on 10 September 2014 by the letter of the Director General of the Department for Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland.

The Project document does not contain an articulated exit strategy.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Evaluation did not reconstruct the Project's Theory of Change given the lack of institutional memory due to the substantive changes in the Project focus and logic of intervention and departure of staff and stakeholders associated with the initial phase.



### *Execution and Implementation Modalities*

The Project was directly implemented (DIM) by UNDP Country Office Georgia in partnership with the Ministry of Environment Protection as the responsible party.

The Project was managed by the Project Manager with the support of the Admin/Finance Assistant and the driver, who comprised the Project Management Unit (PMU). The Project hired a Field Coordinator in June 2012, however, upon the departure of the latter, the Project did not hire a new Field Coordinator, replacing her with the Farmers' Extension Centre Manager in January 2013 after the Centre started operation.

The UNDP Country Office provided operational support for Project activities, which included explaining UNDP processes to the PMU, processing and obtaining documentation, submission of requisitions and purchase orders for Project implementation. All requests were reviewed and approved by the Environment Team Leader, who acted as the Project Assurance.

Funds received from the Government of Finland were managed by UNDP Georgia, which provided Chart of Accounts (COA) to the PMU to charge specific activities. The Project employed different contractual arrangements with implementing partners: Letters of Agreement were signed with the Legal Entities of Public Law (LEPL) Community College Opizari (former Vocational College OPIZARI), Basic Sapling Nursery and the National Forestry Agency, whereby funds were budgeted quarterly and advanced at the beginning of each quarter upon execution of 80% of funds; Biological Farming Association ELKANA and Association Oxfam GB Representation in Georgia had signed Micro Capital Grant Agreements and received funds in 3 tranches: upon signature of agreement, upon submission of deliverables and upon submission of final reports. Finally, Ecovision and a number of other contractors (construction companies, hotels, etc.) were contracted through standard institutional contract and received funds upon delivery of services and products.

The Project Executive Board met 9 times by the time of the Evaluation (3 times in 2012 and 2013, twice in 2014 and once in 2015). The PEB meetings, which involved the representatives of the Project, UNDP Georgia, Government of Georgia and the donor, discussed project implementation, challenges, and progress and made decisions about Project priorities and adjustments. Senior Management of UNDP Georgia was regularly represented by the Deputy Resident Representative, Assistant Resident Representative Energy and Environment Team Leader and, on special occasions, by the UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative.

### *Strategic Partnerships*

The Project has established successful partnerships at the national and local levels. The Project has strengthened its collaboration with the national and local Governments through the Ministries of Environment Protection and Education, municipalities of Borjomi and Tsagveri. Ministry of Defense was also briefly engaged, providing approximately 20 soldiers for a PR event to mark the start of reforestation. The Project also cooperated with the LEPLs Agricultural Cooperatives Development Agency and National Food Agency, under the Ministry of Agriculture.

The Project also advanced in fostering partnerships at the local level, through grassroots organizations in the recipient communities and national and international NGOs operating at the local and national levels, such as Biological Farming Association ELKANA, Union for Sustainable Development ECOVISION, CENN, GIZ, Association Oxfam GB Representation in Georgia and the Greens' Movement of Georgia.

#### *Implementation Constraints*

The initial phase of the entire Borjomi Initiative<sup>8</sup> has been marred by numerous obstacles, mostly of institutional nature, which stagnated the implementation and resulted in the refocusing of the intervention. The current Project had inherited these obstacles and initiated operation in a *challenging institutional environment*, whereby the national counterparts questioned the Project rationale and overall UNDP role and restricted access to forests. Since the return of the Forestry Agency to the Ministry of Environment Protection, the institutional settings had become more favorable, and the Project succeeded in establishing a close partnership with key national stakeholders.

The arrival of the new Project Manager in 2011 also helped enhance the implementation, which was carried on relatively and according to the plan after the initial challenges. The remaining obstacles encountered in the course of implementation have been primarily related to the overall institutional weaknesses, low environmental awareness and weak human resource capacities of beneficiaries and stakeholders.

Another notable challenge has been the *lack of interest and non-responsiveness* of the local population, which resisted the entry of the Project in their communities due to the overall suspicion and lack of confidence in the potential results. This resistance, at times verging on hostility, caused initial delays and required significant efforts from the Project. Due to a strong advocacy and communication work carried out by the Project Manager, the Project succeeded in generating interest and trust among the potential beneficiaries and started operation. Once the hostility and resistance were overcome and the initial positive results started to trickle in, the Project did not encounter major obstacles at the community level.

See Chapter 6. Findings, for a more detailed description of challenges and limitations.

## **CHAPTER 4. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

### *Evaluation Objectives*

In line with the Evaluation Terms of Reference, the specific objectives of the Evaluation are to assess:

- Project design;
- Project implementation;
- Project outputs, outcomes and potential impact.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Evaluation uses “Borjomi Initiative” to denote both Project implemented by UNDP with the Finnish funding: “*Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008*” and *Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*”

### *Evaluation Scope*

The unit of analysis was the Project “*Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment*” in its entirety. The Evaluation covered all aspects of the project included in the period of 1 April 2012 – 31 December 2015 focusing on project outputs and activities as described in the Project Document signed on 20 April 2012:

1. Expected Output 1 – Livelihoods of local people in the villages adjacent to the affected forest areas become more sustainable;
2. Expected Output 2: Disaster resilience of target villages is increased through risk reduction measures;
3. Expected Output 3: Informal environmental education at secondary schools introduced;
4. Expected Output 4: Responsible attitude to environment grows in target area  
Public awareness on and sound management of natural resources is increased;
5. Expected Output 5: Project Management.

The Evaluation also assessed the contributions of the Project to the Country Programme Outcome and Output mentioned on p. 6.

The Evaluation assessed the relevance and adequacy of the baselines, indicators, and targets using the SMART criteria, the effectiveness of Project interventions and the efficiency in the use of financial and human resources.

The Evaluation assessed the likelihood of sustainability of the Project results, including implementation, coordination and communication arrangements and its potential impact. To the extent possible the Evaluation also assessed the existence of political will and the level of ownership of the Project results in the recipient government and communities to evaluate the sustainability of the initiative.

The Evaluation assessed strategic partnerships, inter-institutional coordination, and communication and the support provided by the UNDP Country Office. The Evaluation also assessed the knowledge management mechanisms and products, their relevance, applicability and replicability, and their contribution to the advancement of the disaster risk reduction and sustainable development agenda in the country.

The Evaluation collected the lessons learned in the course of the Project implementation, including those learned by the implementing partners, beneficiaries, and the Project Management Unit.

The Evaluation focused on the output level and the contributions of the Project outputs at the outcome level.

The Evaluation did **not** assess the Project “*Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008*”, however, the Evaluation Team considered all relevant data from the first phase, deemed essential for understanding and evaluating of the current Project. See Chapter 5. Evaluation Approach, Methodology and Data Analysis for a detailed description of the use of the initial phase in the analysis.

The Evaluation did **not** assess the financial management of the Project, however, it reviewed the administrative management implementation modalities, financial and administrative arrangements and financial and human resource capacities to the extent they affected the achievement of Project outputs and implementation of planned activities.

The Evaluation did **not** assess the technical quality of the knowledge products, methodological guidelines, and tools. These were evaluated in terms of their utility and relevance for the achievement of the objectives of the Project.

The cost of Evaluation is US\$ 14,030, which represents less than 1% of the total Project budget (US\$ 1,505,593), approved in April 2012.

#### *Evaluation Criteria and Questions*

The Evaluation criteria are based on the four principles described in UNDP's *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* as well as in the UNEG and The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) norms: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The commonly used definitions of these criteria have been amended by the PMU and are spelled out in the Evaluation Terms of Reference as follows:

- *Relevance* – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time;
- *Effectiveness* – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved;
- *Efficiency* – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible;
- *Sustainability* – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The additional evaluation criterion of *results*, included in the Terms of Reference by the Project Management Unit was assessed jointly with the *effectiveness* criterion and comprised the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes and effects produced by the Project. Results included direct Project outputs, short and medium-term outcomes, and longer-term potential impact including replication effects and other, local effects.

Interview and focus group questions were constructed on the basis of the evaluation criteria mentioned above as well as on the respondents' particular role and involvement in the Project. The questions comprised overall relevance of the Project activities in the national and local context, relevance and sustainability of implementation mechanisms and tools, quality of pilot interventions and services provided by the Project, major achievements, and problems, lessons learned and replicability of results, strategic coordination, institutional coordination, etc.

Specific questions related to the Project design, the relevance of outputs, activity indicators, baseline data and targets, administrative and financial management arrangements and the like were directed to the respondents directly involved in the Project implementation, which are presented in Annex 3. List of Evaluation Respondents.

A consolidated list of indicative questions is given in Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix.

## CHAPTER 5. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

### *Data sources*

The Evaluation used the following data sources: UNDP strategic and programmatic frameworks; methodological guides and manuals; national strategic documents and conceptual frameworks; institutional and legal maps and frameworks; project documents, revisions, plans and budgets; project reports; stakeholder information; knowledge products produced by the Project and stakeholders; and financial information.

The full list of the data sources is given in Annex 4: Data Sources and Bibliography.

### *Sample and Sampling Frame*

The type and methodology of the Evaluation were determined by various factors: nature of the project; scope of the Evaluation; and quality of the available data and sampling method.

The present Evaluation is a *non-random process and result* evaluation at the *output level*.

The size and the structure of the sample were directly related to the specific task at hand: to test the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Project results and to identify lessons learned for future interventions.

The Evaluation used a *Purposive* sampling method, whereby the respondents were *intentionally* selected from the population of the Project beneficiaries and stakeholders on the basis of their association with and knowledge of the Project. It was combined with the *Snowball or Chain Referral* sampling method whereby additional respondents were identified by the initial group of respondents and Project Management and added to the sample. The sample was tentatively divided into 4 categories: Beneficiaries (24 respondents), Implementing Partners (31), Corporate (10) and Other (3)<sup>9</sup>.

### *Basic Statistics*

The Evaluation reviewed more than 70 Project-related documents and reference materials, including audio-visual and multimedia products and conducted field visits to five Project sites (Borjomi, Tsagveri, Daba, Timotesubani and Mzetamze). All selected sites provided evidence of different types of pilot activities carried out by the Project.

The Evaluation interviewed 68 respondents, of whom 43 were women, and 25 were men. The Evaluation carried out 22 individual and 11 group (1-3 persons) interviews and 3 focus group meetings. The majority of the interviews were conducted in person, whereas 5 were carried out by telephone/Skype. See Annex 3. List of Evaluation Respondents - for more details about the respondents.

---

<sup>9</sup> The category *Implementing Partners* includes all entities that have contributed to the implementation of the Project activities and achievement of the results; the *Corporate* category comprises the respondents from UNDP, including Senior Management, Project Management Unit and other persons associated with UNDP; the category *Other* comprises the donors and the Austrian Development Agency.

### *Data Collection Procedures and Instruments*

Given the design and the scope of the Evaluation (terminal evaluation of the results of a finishing project), the Evaluation Team did not apply experimental methods, which involve controlled variables and random sampling for treatment and control groups. The Evaluation Team worked with a non-random sample constructed from the population of project beneficiaries and stakeholders from participating institutions and communities, including the UNDP, the donor government, and international/national NGOs. Of applicable quasi – experimental methods, the pre-post methodology was considered plausible for measuring the change or improvement among the beneficiaries throughout the Project.

Given the characteristics of the sample, the Evaluation applied predominantly *qualitative* data collection methodology. The selection of a qualitative analysis method was determined by the *type* of the Evaluation, that is, *ex-post non-experimental process and results evaluation*. In those cases when the sample is not randomly selected, but pre-determined (purposive), quantitative methods are difficult to apply. Furthermore, quantitative methods are best suited for measuring levels and changes in impacts and for drawing inferences from observed statistical relations between those impacts and other covariates. They are less effective, however, in understanding *process*—that is, the mechanisms by which a particular intervention instigates a series of events that ultimately result in the observed impact<sup>10</sup>. The current Evaluation was a *process* (output) evaluation as it evaluated the delivery of results, effectiveness, efficiency, etc. rather than an outcome or impact.

The *primary qualitative* data was comprised of the knowledge, opinions and commentary of the stakeholders and beneficiaries. This information was gathered through a combination of the evaluators' observations and inputs received from the semi-structured interviews and focus groups. See Annex 3. List of Evaluation Respondents for more information about the mode of interviews/focus groups.

The *secondary qualitative* data was comprised of the information generated by the Project, UNDP Country Offices, and national/local stakeholders and included methodological instruments, manuals, reports, and audio-visual materials and the like. See Annex 4. Data Sources and Bibliography for the list of data sources.

The proportion of the weight of the primary and secondary qualitative data in the final analysis is approximately 60:40.

In addition to the qualitative data, the Evaluation also applied *quantitative methods* by rating the four basic evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability). The rating was applied during the interviews and focus groups. The respondents were requested to rate the above four criteria on a scale from 1 to 5, the latter being the highest. In view of the varied understanding of the above criteria by the respondents, the Evaluation provided the definitions to facilitate the rating and ensure

---

<sup>10</sup> Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Program Evaluation, (with Michael Woolcock), in Francois Bourgingnon and Luiz Pereira Da Silva (edited) *Tool Kit for Evaluating the Poverty and Distributional Impact of Economic Policies*, World Bank and Oxford University Press, 2003

relative homogeneity and comparability of the responses. Given the different level of engagement in the Project, not all participants were able to rate the Project according to the four established criteria. Altogether, 16 ratings were provided by individual respondents and groups. The Evaluation tried to minimize the response bias by wording the questions without suggesting the leading opinion. The share of quantitative data in the final analysis is approximately 10 %.

To increase the credibility of data and its internal and external validity, the Evaluation applied the methods of methodological and data triangulation, cross-analyzing qualitative and quantitative information obtained from different data sources. The Evaluation cross-examined the data from the category Beneficiaries with the findings obtained from the categories Implementing Partners, Corporate, and Other. The Evaluation then referenced the findings with the secondary data sources. Afterwards, the Evaluation triangulated the findings with the quantitative ratings described above.

In addition to above-mentioned traditional triangulation methods, the Evaluation Team applied the hypothetical counterfactual (what would have happened if the Project had not been refocused) using the initial phase of the intervention - the Project “*Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008*” – as the “control” as opposed to the current Project as the “treatment”. Relevant respondents were asked to compare the relevance and potential impact of both Projects. While not scientifically valid, this comparison allowed comparing the potential impacts of the two projects through *participative impact evaluation* method, which permitted to assess the *perceptions* of the respondents about both projects. This, in turn, allowed evaluating the appropriateness of the decision to refocus the initial intervention from a relatively straightforward reforestation initiative towards a more multi-sectorial approach.

#### *Methodological Limitations and Challenges*

Qualitative analysis centers on the understanding and observation without control and is considered subjective and descriptive. Despite the UNDP focus on the results, the qualitative analysis focuses mainly on the processes, is not generalizable and presents internal and external validity challenges. As compared with the quantitative approach, qualitative analysis seeks to gauge potential impacts that the project may generate, the mechanisms of such impacts, and the extent of benefits to recipients from individual and group-based interviews. Whereas quantitative results can be generalizable, the qualitative results may not be, especially with smaller samples.

Nonetheless, qualitative methods generate information that may be critical for understanding the mechanisms through which the program helps beneficiaries (World Bank Handbook on Impact Evaluation), allow more in-depth and subjective examination of complex cases, that are not easily examinable with quantitative research methods, and give more flexibility to investigation as it is not limited to rigid variables. Qualitative analysis, albeit non-generalizable, allows for better understanding the mechanisms through which the program helps beneficiaries<sup>11</sup>, and permits to work with issues related to “soft” and intangible products associated with processes, as well as perceptions related

<sup>11</sup> World Bank Handbook on Impact Evaluation, Quantitative Methods and Practices, Khandker, Shahidur, Koolwal, Gayatri, Samad, Hussain, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2010

to knowledge and capacities. It allows evaluating potential impacts, generating critical information for the understanding of the problem and construction of the intervention, providing in-depth analysis of complex cases, which are difficult to evaluate quantitatively.

Given the qualitative nature of the analysis, one of the main methodological challenges encountered by the Evaluation was obtaining *comparable primary data* to analyze the Project according to the evaluation criteria.

Firstly, the pre-post method does not allow assuming with all confidence that the Project was the only influencing factor over the changes in the outputs and ensuring the *internal validity* of the evaluation, which is best achieved through experimental methods. On the other hand, the *quality of the sample*, selected through the Stratified Purposive Sampling method has limited statistical value, as it is not representative of the entire population, and does not allow for the generalization of the findings i.e. *external validity* also posed a challenge.

However, the Stratified Purposive sampling method has several *advantages*: given that the Evaluation aimed at particular subsets of the population of the Project beneficiaries and stakeholders, the selection of participants was based on a specific set of criteria, which allowed to construct relatively homogeneous sub-groups and increase the external validity; the current sample structure allowed to better illustrate the tendencies within a particular subgroup and facilitated comparisons between them; this in turn allowed to identify the consensus and deviations from consensus in the perceptions of respondents within the subgroups; finally the used sampling method was compatible with the participative impact evaluation methodology applied for triangulation and assessment of the potential impact, which is based primarily on the perceptions of the respondents and does not require the existence of a counterfactual.

Another methodological challenge was related to a *varied understanding* of the concepts of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Some respondents did not have sufficient information to rate all criteria. On those occasions, where the respondents were unable to rate *all* criteria, the quantitative rating was not applied.

To address the methodological challenges, the Evaluation provided explanations when necessary and applied the methods of methodological and data triangulation explained on p. 23.

#### *Other Evaluation Challenges*

The Evaluation did not experience major challenges related to the lack of data and/or financial resources, which were readily available for proper planning and carrying out the Evaluation.

The only notable challenge has been related to the format of indicators, targets, and baselines listed in the Results and Resources Framework. As noted on p. 15, the majority of indicators were not specific, measurable, and time-bound while the targets were mostly formulated as activities and results. Likewise, the Project has not carried out ex-ante and ex-post surveys that would have allowed establishing proxy indicators for measuring the change in perceptions and attitudes, gains in income, harvest, etc. Instead, the Evaluation



Team relied on empirical observations and individual opinions, which allowed estimating the change towards the result.

Another relatively minor obstacle has been related to the lack of knowledge of the entire Project among some respondents who were engaged during the different stages of the Borjomi Initiative. However, this did not represent a significant challenge and did not hamper the analysis of data.

#### *Stakeholder Participation*

The Evaluation was guided by the fundamental premise of transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders, which are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process. As defined by the UNEG, consultation during the evaluation process “improves the credibility and quality of the evaluation, [it] can facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations”<sup>12</sup>. *UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* states, that “... key partners and stakeholders must play an integral part in the evaluation from the outset to ensure national ownership of the results.”

In line with these provisions, the Project management and stakeholders were fully engaged directly in the Evaluation. The respondents were duly informed of the forthcoming Evaluation and its purposes and made themselves available for interviews.

#### *Ethical Considerations*

In line with the *UNDP Evaluation Policy* and the *UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*, the Evaluation was based on the principles of independence, intentionality, transparency and ethical integrity. The Evaluation team briefed the respondents about the Evaluation scope and objectives before each interview. On those occasions when the interviews were recorded, the responses were requested the permission to record.

#### *Background Information*

The Evaluation was conducted by a Team of independent consultants Nana Gibradze and Kate Skhireli, selected in accordance with the Terms of Reference elaborated by the Project Manager in consultation with the Environment Team Leader. The Team Leader was identified from the *RBEC Associate Experts Monitoring and Evaluation Roster*. The Team Member was identified on the basis of recommendations received from other UNDP projects. The final selection was done on the basis of the proposals submitted by the candidates. Please refer to Annex 7 for the brief biographies of the Evaluation Team Members.

## **CHAPTER 6. FINDINGS**

This chapter presents the findings based on the *evidence* obtained from the respondents during the interviews and through the revision of the Project-related documentation. The findings are structured along the evaluation criteria and include the description of

---

<sup>12</sup> Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, UNEG

strengths and limitations that affected the achievement of outputs and activities related to gender mainstreaming and vulnerable groups

#### *Relevance*

Analysis of the primary and secondary data points that the *intervention logic* has been considered relevant as it opened different entry points for intervention and allowed addressing priorities and needs at local and at times, at national levels. The Project has introduced multi-sectorial approach to local level sustainable development, testing different models of income generation, capacity strengthening, awareness raising and environmental protection and responding to the needs of local vulnerable populations. In the region, traditionally relying on recreational tourism, there was a need for alternative methods of income generation and livelihood protection, while simultaneously restoring the region's attractiveness for local tourism. The intervention has been relevant at the national level as well as it has addressed the existing gaps in environmental education and awareness, community participation and civic engagement.

The Project has been *innovative* in that it based the intervention on rigorous scientific research and involved scientific expertise in designing agricultural and environmental interventions. The Project has been innovative in applying the experimental method of gradual testing of different approaches in order to identify most optimal solutions and achieve utmost efficiency. An excellent example of this method is the pilot sapling plot where two different methods of cultivation were tested: planting and seeding. Testing these methods beforehand and identifying the most suitable and sustainable method of reforestation allowed minimizing the risk of failure and ensuring high percentage of sapling survival.

The Project has been *catalytic* in that it triggered a series of processes locally and nationally, expected to have significant impact. Thus, the Project has given start to farmers associations in Borjomi municipality that have already shown signs of growth and expansion and have been steadily generating income and improving their capacities. The emphasis the Project has put on engaging communities through youth eco-clubs has been overwhelmingly praised as catalytic given the positive shift in attitudes towards environment protection and sustainability. Knowledge products (e.g. Teachers' Guidebook and Young Forester's Guide) and processes (e.g. certification of organic produce, energy efficiency measures) generated by the Project have triggered processes at national (e.g. inclusion of the Guidebook in schools nationwide) and local (e.g. initiative by guest-hose owners to install solar batteries) levels.

The Project structure, planning and implementation modality have been fully adequate and responded to local and national needs and UNDP strategic priorities. At the national level, the Project responded to the draft *Law on Forests*<sup>13</sup> (Forestry Code), *Law on Environmental Protection* and its amendments and in particular, to the national strategy on "*Environmental Education for Sustainable Development*". At the corporate level, the Project logic and planned results resonated with the priorities of UNDP Strategic Plan for 2008-2011. Moreover, the comprehensive multi-sectorial approach of the Project resonates with the rationale of the current Strategic Plan 2014-2017, namely, *Area of*

---

<sup>13</sup> Draft, pending approval by the Parliament of Georgia.

*Work 1: Sustainable Development Pathways*, combining such essential elements as analysis and advocacy and scalable initiatives on sustainable productive capacities (including sustainable access to energy and energy efficiency).

Overall, the Project has been considered highly relevant for national and corporate priorities at the moment of inception and presently. The overwhelming majority of the respondents affirmed that the Project continues to be relevant and merits continuation. Moreover, the majority of the respondents considered the current Project more relevant for national priorities, than the original initiative.

The average rating of Project relevance is 4.9 with the predominant rating being 5 and the only rating of 4.

### *Effectiveness*

Based on the analysis of targets and indicators contained in the RRF, by the time of the Evaluation, 99% of the Project activities have been implemented, and Project products produced. The change in the output has been positive and largely measurable albeit challenging, given that many of the baselines, indicators and targets do not correspond to SMART criteria (see p. 15). However, analysis of data obtained from reports and respondents confirmed the increase in overall satisfaction with the Project intervention, increase in awareness and civism, knowledge and skills (small scale tourism and hotel management, agricultural practices, environmental management, energy efficiency), increase in production and income (strawberry, raspberry, wheat and vegetable production in farmers' cooperatives, guest houses), increase in community participation as compared to the start of the Project. The evaluators confirmed the completion and quality of infrastructure works carried out by the Project (refurbishing of guesthouses, Tsagveri park and library, energy efficiency installations, farming and irrigation equipment and tools, etc.) and verified the success of reforestation activities, where an impressive 75% sapling survival rate was reported.

The Project implementation has been largely stable, with the exception of the initial phase, when the start was delayed due to the resistance of local population and overall low level of awareness and interest. Once the obstacles were overcome and the local residents engaged in the Project activities, the implementation had been smooth and according to the plan. All important seasonal milestones (planting, construction, land cultivation) have been met, and activities carried out as planned.

The quality of the interventions has been considered high. The data analysis, which includes respondent opinions and observation, points to the high quality of training materials and sessions, public awareness and advocacy tools and processes, knowledge products and practices, infrastructure works and agricultural services.

The Project has been effective at the corporate level as well, by contributing to *a culture of safety and resilience [...] built at all levels using knowledge, innovation, and education*, as stipulated in the UNDAF Outcome 3. The Project has piloted *sustainable practices and instruments for the management of natural resources, including land, water and biological resources*, which have the potential to be *up scaled at national and trans boundary levels*. (Expected Country Programme Output).

Analysis of primary and secondary data indicates that all output results have been largely achieved:

*Expected Output 1 – Livelihoods of local people in the villages adjacent to the affected forest areas become more sustainable.*

The Project has achieved almost all planned results for Output 1: the local nursery adjacent to the reforested plots has been established and is engaging students from local schools in cultivating saplings that are to be used for subsequent reforestation activities; three agro farming cooperatives have been established with members reporting increase in income as a result of training and material support provided by the Project; 100 farmers trained in bio-farming and 43 farmers started producing biologically clean produce; rural farmers' association has been registered as a legal entity comprising 3 cooperatives, 18 guest houses, and 15 individual farmers and is offering services to member cooperatives; 25 local guides and guest-house owners trained on rural tourism service provision<sup>14</sup>; energy efficiency and alternative energy measures introduced; solar heaters and bio-toilets installed in participating guesthouses and Tsagveri kindergarten.

Instead of the planned agro-shop the Project facilitated opening of a farmers' market, which sells local produce, including harvest from Project-financed farmers' cooperatives;

Within the extension service component the Project established veterinary service, however, it had to be canceled after the first year given the low interest from local populations and unwillingness to pay for services. This was primarily due to the lack of awareness of the importance of the veterinary services since livestock and dairy production are not traditional sources of income but have local subsistence importance. On the other hand, it was due to the institutional and regulatory deficiencies existing in the country. Given that there are no strict sanitary requirements and vaccination and milk inspection are not mandatory for farmers, the latter did not feel motivated to peruse the veterinary services provided by the Project. This was exacerbated by the limited local funds to finance the adequate presence of a veterinarian in Tsagveri.

*Expected Output 2: Disaster resilience of target villages is increased through risk reduction measures.*

The Evaluation could not verify whether the disaster resilience in target villages has increased given the absence of measurable data, however, the analysis of provided information suggests that the Project has laid a solid basis for increased disaster risk awareness, and introduced awareness on key elements of disaster prevention, mitigation, response and recovery.

The Project has carried out the majority of planned activities spelled out in the Results and Resources Framework: disaster risks, local vulnerability and capacity assessments have been conducted; community and village emergency groups formed and trained; local maps, emergency management and contingency plans prepared; seasonal calendar of disasters affecting agricultural production and livelihoods developed; village profiles

---

<sup>14</sup> Overall, more than 100 trainings were offered to local residents on hospitality, sanitation, energy efficiency, bio-farming.

established; warning systems established; basic proposal writing skills strengthened and project proposals elaborated for municipal funding.

The Project has cleaned and fenced 60 ha of burnt forest and reforested 60 hectares planting more than 81,000 saplings. An outstanding 75% of sapling survival rate has been reported in 2015. Of these saplings, pine had 99% of survival. In line with the existing agreement between the Project and the National Forestry Agency, the latter financed two posts of forest guards, to protect the newly planted saplings from grazing.

The Project did not construct the gabions considered during the earlier stages of the Project, which were envisaged to accompany the reforestation works and protect the local villages from landslides resulting from soil erosion. In consultation with local experts, the construction of gabions had been canceled as they were considered costly compared to their limited effectiveness in the selected terrain.

*Expected Output 3: Informal environmental education at secondary schools introduced.*

The third expected output has been accomplished in its entirety. The Project established 6 eco-clubs in the schools of Borjomi municipality, training more than 700 school-children and their teachers and organized eco-camps in Ureki, Lagodekhi, Kobuleti, Tsalkubo with the participation of 120 children; members of the eco-clubs have organized awareness-raising and fundraising activities for their communities and peers, participated in public outreach events and produced advocacy materials for dissemination; more than 100 children obtained certificates of environment defender, young ranger and young forester.

In addition to eco-clubs, the Project has developed and disseminated 1,000 copies of the Teachers' Guidebook on Environmental Education for extracurricular environmental education as well as the Young Foresters' Manual for youth interested in engaging in forest protection and management activities. In collaboration with the Ministry of Education, the Project has created informal environmental education programme, which comprises theory, practice and research on water safety, forest management and restoration, biodiversity, waste management, energy efficiency, bio-farming and healthy way of life.

Two youth conferences were organised 'Human Influence on Environment' and "My Environment", where 100 children from Borjomi, Gori, Tbilisi, Kaspi, Zugdidi and Tsinandali schools presented their research projects.

*Expected Output 4: Responsible attitude to environment grows in target area. Public awareness on and sound management of natural resources is increased.*

According to the data obtained through Rapid Rural Assessment, environmental awareness among local population at the beginning of the Project was rather low. Based on the responses of the interviewed respondents, the Evaluation Team identified evidence of positive change in public awareness towards the environment, however, due to the size of sample and absence of measurable baseline and indicators, it was not possible to verify the extent of the change. This said, the Evaluation noted that all of the activities listed in the Project document have been achieved satisfactorily: in collaboration with local eco-clubs, Borjomi municipality, Borjomi TV Station and national TV and radio broadcasters, the Project organized public outreach events, such as celebrations of international

environment day, community meetings, distributed visual materials produced by the eco-clubs, organized televised debates and talk-shows on environmental issues of local importance with the participation of local youth. Overall, the Project has organized 9 TV programmes in Borjomi TV, Imedi, and GDS national TV stations, a special programme “*Farmers’ Hour*” on Georgian Public TV channel, and radio programmes “*Right and Freedom*” and “*Ecometer*” on Radio 1.

The respondents considered the *management arrangements* as adequate and fruitful highlighting the support provided by the Project Management Unit as crucial for Project success. Likewise, the respondents underscored the stakeholder coordination as successful and productive. The overwhelming majority of respondents credited the Project Manager with the successful implementation of the Project and achievement of innovative and largely sustainable results with reasonably high potential impact. (See p. 31 - *Sustainability*). The Project has been successful in forging strategic partnerships with national and local governmental institutions and with external partners, the most notable example being the partnership with the Austrian Government.

The Project has had a number of *positive unplanned results*, which added *value* to Project interventions. While not targeting directly the capacities of implementing partners, it has been reported by various respondents that the Project had contributed to the improvement of institutional and technical capacities and visibility. Thus, the Vocational College Opizari has benefitted from the collaboration with the Project in that it had increased its visibility in the region with no vocational colleges and has attracted potential students from the beneficiary villages. As a result of collaboration with the Project, the Tsagveri public school, and LEPL Community College Opizari applied to a Millennium Challenge Corporation grant to upgrade the school infrastructure and develop agricultural specializations in the college, Opizari has started including environmental responsibility in its curriculum. One of the farmers’ cooperatives has recently started the organic certification process, supported by the Project through the Bio-Farmers Association ELKANA.

Likewise, the Basic Sapling Nursery and Forestry Agency have reported increased capacities and positioning after participation in the reforestation activities in the region. The sales of saplings by the Nursery have increased as well after the Project intervention, which helped strengthen their planning and budgeting capacities. The different methods of sampling cultivation, tested by the Project on the experimental plot have provided the Forestry Agency and the Sapling Nursery with the important lessons on most effective methods for reforestation.

While the Project did not specifically address the training needs of the local media, staff participating in communication and outreach activities have reported increased awareness and knowledge of environmental issues and expressed interest in further pursuing learning and training opportunities. Overall, the Project was credited for reviving the culture of participation and community collaboration in a largely dormant population.

The stakeholders have benefitted from the data generated from assessments and studies conducted by the Project. Two most significant publications – the Teachers’ Guidebook and Young Foresters’ Manual – were the unplanned outcomes of the education component and are expected to benefit a large number of teachers and students country-

wide. Technical information on bio-farming published by the Project has been in high demand from farmers in the region. Stakeholders have also benefitted from the awareness and outreach campaign carried out by the Project. As mentioned by one of the government representatives, many government officials did not fully comprehend the importance of public awareness and communication work and its potential impact, until they observed the change in population attitudes.

As a spillover effect of the eco-clubs, at least 18 municipal schools benefitted from awareness activities, with some forming own clubs and starting the collection of recyclable waste. Eco-club members have improved their social and leadership capacities and have learned scientific research, communication, and proposal writing skills, developing and obtaining small grants for future activities. It was reported that some members of eco-clubs have started partnerships with peers from other regions and countries through eco-camps, started learning languages and expressed interest in studying and working in the area of environmental protection. Eco-club members have also reportedly influenced their parents, who are now engaged in the waste collection, environmental activities and spreading awareness in their neighborhoods.

The average rating of Project effectiveness is 4.8. The lowest rating obtained in this category is 4.5. The most frequent rating – 5.

### *Efficiency*

Analysis of the primary and secondary data indicates that the Project financial, human and time resources *have been sufficient* for the planned results. The funds have been *efficiently used* and the Project has achieved more than initially planned.

Evidence obtained from Project reports and respondents indicates that the funds have been adequately planned and executed in accordance with the Annual Workplans and the approved budgets. By the time of the Evaluation, the total Project delivery rate was 98%, and the Project was on track to achieve 100% execution by the end of December.

According to the evidence obtained through the analysis of project documents and interviews, careful assessment of forthcoming interventions has allowed the Project to avoid unnecessary expenditures. In fact, the Project has achieved significant savings that have allowed it to extend Project duration and fund additional activities<sup>15</sup>.

One example of such efficiency is the experimental approach to cultivating saplings for reforestation purposes, whereby two different methods (planting vs. sowing) were tested for highest survival rates. By identifying the most effective method with minimal costs, the Project avoided the risk of possible failure and respective loss of Project funds. Likewise, the Project has opted to target the most damaged plot with the lowest probability of self-restoration by natural processes, increasing the value per dollar invested.

The Project has been efficient in the use of time. Given the seasonal milestones limiting the construction and agricultural activities, the Project has been able to efficiently plan and execute activities according to the established calendar of works. The use of human

---

<sup>15</sup> One example of activities funded from savings was a GEL 27,000 grant competition for solar panel installation in Tsagveri, administered by ELKANA.

resources has been efficient as well. The cost of a three-person Project Management Unit over 3 years represents 12% of the total Project cost and 13% of the net Project cost<sup>16</sup>. Overall, resources allocated for management purposes represent 25% of the total Project cost and 27% of the net Project cost. These include costs of PMU, office maintenance, stationary and audio-visual equipment, travel, evaluation, PEB meetings, communication, publication and translation costs and miscellaneous charges.

The Project has been successful in attracting additional resources from the partners. In addition to securing in-kind contributions from local and national institutions, the Project has also attracted external co-financing. Thus, of the total cost of GEL 27,413 for Tzagveri Library refurbishment and energy efficiency measures, the local municipality contributed GEL 14,400; Likewise, of GEL 100,000 spent on the rehabilitation of Tzagveri Park, the municipality share amounted to GEL 37,561.56. In addition to the planned four talk-shows, financed by the Project, Borjomi TV broadcast one additional talk-show, worth of GEL 2,000. Prudent planning and expenditure have allowed the Project to include an additional village Tba in Disaster Risk Reduction component, implemented by OXFAM. The National Forestry Agency contributed GEL 299,462 for additional reforestation activities. Finally, Austrian Government financed reforestation works on two plots adjacent to Project sites, under the grant agreement with the Georgian Government, worth GEL 750,000.

To increase the ownership and future sustainability of the results, the Project requested co-financing from guesthouse owners, whose property has been refurbished by the Project. The contributions varied from 25-40% (with the average percentage being 34%) and were determined on the basis of average earnings from the guesthouse. Thus, of the total cost of GEL 39,217 for the guesthouse refurbishing, owners contributed GEL 13,528. Likewise, the farmers were requested to finance approximately 23% of the costs, contributing GEL 29,159.80 against the GEL 98,961.85 of the Project funds. The total amount of co-financing and parallel financing obtained by the Project is GEL 1,146,111.

The average rating of the efficiency of the Project is 4.8 with 5 being the most frequent rating and 4 being the lowest.

### *Sustainability*

Opinions about the degree of Project sustainability have been *mostly positive*. Evidence suggests that most key components of the Project have achieved a notable degree of sustainability, especially taking into account the pilot nature of the intervention, limited implementation timeframe and existing obstacles and limitations (See p. 36 - *Strengths and Limitations*). Most threats to sustainability are of exogenous nature and are related to the general situation in the country, low environmental awareness and apathy, deficient legal base and institutional settings, weak compliance mechanisms, lack of incentives and the like.

While the Project Document does not provide a specific exit strategy, the sustainability measures and the relevant exit strategies have been discussed with the stakeholders in the course of implementation and developed for each component. These consultations

---

<sup>16</sup> Total Project budget after deducting GMS, communication and miscellaneous costs.



ensured the maximum level of ownership from the beginning and provided reasonable guarantees for ex-post monitoring and support by stakeholders.

According to the analysis of the evidence, *the Expected Output 1* has solid prospects of sustainability. The Rural Farmers Association Green Valley, established by the Project is a legally registered entity, with a mission, vision, statute and organizational structure, trained and motivated staff and fee-paying members. The organization has already obtained the support of the municipal authorities that have allocated office space free of charge for a year and has won a small grant to support its operational costs<sup>17</sup>. The Association maintains the database of local farmers, hotels/guesthouses, agricultural production, etc., which is an invaluable resource for future interventions. The organization is a member of ELKANA and is likely to participate in ELKANA activities in Samtskhe-Javakheti region. The Association has high prospects of sustainability given that it is the only organization with capacities and resources in the region, and is a natural candidate for becoming an implementing partner for the Government and donors, such as Mercy Corps and ENPARD – European Neighborhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development that is about to launch its activities in Borjomi. Other than a force majeure occurrence, the main challenge to the sustainability of the Association is the dwindling of interest of farmers and reluctance to pay the fees, which, while low (GEL 10 for individual farmers and guest houses and GEL 35 for cooperatives, paid annually), may be costly for local farmers.

Farmers' cooperatives created and strengthened by the Project, have demonstrated the capacity and commitment to continue, after having piloted the viability of agricultural practices in the eco-villages. The biologically clean produce is quickly gaining popularity and has already resulted in higher incomes not only for the participating cooperatives, but for those individual farmers who were trained by the project. As mentioned earlier, one of the cooperatives (Timotesubani) has started organic certification process and is likely to become the first ever certified producer of organic berries in Georgia, setting a precedent and paving the way for others. The climatic conditions in the region allow harvesting berries and vegetables long after other regions have finished harvests and give the farmers an additional edge on the market. The cooperatives will retain irrigation and cultivation equipment transferred by the Project. The lifting of the suspension on the Land Lease Law will enable the interested cooperatives to lease larger plots of land for cultivation. All farmers trained on organic farming can provide recommendations to newcomers through the Farmers' Association. The only cooperative with relative risk to sustainability is Mzetamze, where the cultivation of wheat on larger territories will require costly agricultural equipment.

Guest houses also have high prospects of sustainability. Training offered by the Project have introduced the locals to the basics of hospitality management in order to provide better services and attract more tourism and have already resulted in increased revenues for most. Rural Development Association 'Green Valley operates a local tourist center, where the staff is trained to inspect guesthouses according to the established standards and provide recommendations, are expected to collaborate with ELKANA within its Samtskhe-Javakheti Small Hotel Programme.

---

<sup>17</sup> ELKANA will monitor the use of grant funds during the year.

The evidence obtained during the interviews suggests that hiking trails are less likely to be sustained. While the component has been properly implemented and advertised, there is little culture of active leisure among the local residents and tourists. Seasonal visitors in Tsagveri mostly prefer a passive vacationing style to mountain hiking and camping and so far have not demonstrated significant interest in perusing the trails established by the Project. Of the energy efficiency and sanitation activities, the most likely to be sustained and expanded is the solar energy component, whereas the sanitation component has not generated interest in population so far.

Sustainability prospects for the *Expected Output 2* are reasonably high. Analysis of data suggests that the forestry component is most likely to be sustained in the short to medium term given the high level of commitment demonstrated by the national counterparts. Thus, in addition to GEL 250,000 allocated by the Forestry Agency in 2015 and 33,000 new saplings to be planted in autumn, GEL 1.5 Million has been requested from the state budget for reforestation and patronage of additional 50 ha in the same area in 2016. The Agency has also committed to at least 5-year monitoring and patronage of the areas reforested by the Project and its partners and is planning to further develop the nursery infrastructure in the region, engaging schoolchildren in sapling cultivation. In terms of legal frameworks, the approval of the Forestry Code is expected before the end of 2015, which will regulate numerous pending aspects of forest management, including the guidelines for non-timber resource production. The Agency is also developing a new vision for forestry management to be presented at the donor conference in early 2016. This vision will comprise ecosystem management, gabions and erosion, environmental education and awareness, but is not likely to include agricultural activities.

Sustainability of the disaster risk reduction results in the target villages is reasonably high. The capacities installed in the communities are likely to be sustained, however, a lot will depend on the commitment of and availability of funds from local municipalities to finance Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) project proposals and procurement of equipment for village and community emergency groups. On the other hand, there is no Law on Volunteering in Georgia, which would provide the regulatory framework for community brigades and encourage volunteer work.

The most significant sustainability challenge for this component is the still low environmental awareness among the local populations and reliance on the forest as the key source of income. While the Evaluation has solid reasons to assume that the population will not destroy fences, which protect the reforested plots, it is likely that grazing will continue on the unfenced territories, potentially destroying the young forest. Likewise, without the steady alternative income, the population is most likely continue illegal logging to meet basic household needs, as timber has been the main source of income for local residents since the decline of the resort industry<sup>18</sup>.

The *Expected Output 3* has shown the highest potential of sustainability. The results of the education and training received through the Project have already been visible. Eco-

---

<sup>18</sup> According to an Austrian study, in the course of the last 16 years, only 12 % of the extracted wood was legally logged (source: Georgian government official).

clubs established and strengthened in the framework of the Project have demonstrated their viability and long-term sustainability prospects. As part of the exit strategy for this component, each eco-club has elaborated a 3-year action plan and has secured the support of the Ministries of Education and Environment Protection, CENN, Ecovision and local municipalities. As a result of the improved capacities, 2 eco-clubs have obtained small grants (GEL 800 each) to finance the expansion of their operations. The clubs plan to continue cultivation and popularization of the endemic varieties of Georgian wheat, first harvested during the Project lifetime and will continue to engage schoolchildren in the local sapling nurseries. The clubs are also continuing the recycling campaign, teaming up with a recycling company in the capital, which arrives to Borjomi to collect recyclable waste, every time 3 tons of paper waste and 250 kg of pet bottles are collected.

The eco-club model is starting to generate interest in the country and commitment from the authorities. Schools in Borjomi region and Kvemo Kartli have expressed interest to replicate the eco-club model. The management of Borjomi Kharagauli Natural Park is committed to training the future rangers after issuing 15 Yong Ranger certificates in 2015. Likewise, the Agrarian University is considering to offer its premises as a training base for future specialists. The local municipality has repeatedly expressed its commitment to support the eco-clubs in all possible ways and will look for ways to incentivize schools to maintain and create new clubs. The Ministry of Education has also expressed the commitment to support the eco-club model and grant credits to teachers who are engaged in eco-clubs.

Another component with high sustainability potential is the environmental education in schools. To-date the environmental education is included in the school curricula. The Teachers' Guidebook, developed with the assistance of the Project has been in high demand and has been highly praised by the practitioners. The Guidebook, which has been widely disseminated in the country, will undergo changes after the approval of the new National Education Plan in 2016 and will be adjusted to the adapted standards for environmental education.

Despite these positive commitments and demonstrated ownership of results, there are still risks to the sustainability of these components. Overworked teachers, who engage in eco-clubs in their free time, need incentives to continue. Likewise, school management needs motivation to support the enthusiastic teachers and students and provide facilities for eco-club activities.

The analysis of data points to the lowest sustainability of the results of the *Expected Output 4*. This is in no ways due to the deficiencies of the intervention strategy or failure to carry out planned activities. As noted above, the Project has carried out all planned activities and has achieved a notable positive shift in the perceptions, awareness and interest of the local population. All evidence points to the fact that public awareness activities of the Project have planted important seeds in the local communities and have made a profound effect on the majority of beneficiaries. Printed material disseminated by the Project will most likely continue its effect and the media, engaged in the Project is committed to carrying on the work on raising environmental awareness.

The low prospect of sustainability is linked to the overall low level of environmental awareness and education in the region and overall in Georgia, where sustainable

environmental management is still considered secondary priority even at the high executive level, as manifested by the existing economic and educational policies. This is true of the media workers, including camera operators and commentators, who largely lack basic knowledge of sustainable development, environmental protection, sustainable agriculture and tourism in order to properly design and implement awareness activities.

Overall, the overwhelming majority of the respondents considered that given the multi-disciplinary nature of the current Project, it has higher prospects of sustainability and impact that the original Project would have had.

The average rating of the Project efficiency is 4.3 with 4 being the most frequent rating and 3.5 being the lowest.

*Gender Mainstreaming and Vulnerable Populations*

Throughout the implementation, the Project has engaged different vulnerable segments of the population: youth, women, and IDPs.

The Evaluation has made interesting observations in the area of gender equality and mainstreaming. While the gender balance among participating beneficiaries was tilted towards men, this was largely due to the fact that more men were involved in labor-intensive activities, such as reforestation, farming and rescue brigades. However, female-led farmer cooperatives have demonstrated tendency to grow and expand and have emerged as the leaders among farmers’ associations. The prevalence of females in the educators’ group reflects the existing situation in the country, where women represent the majority of teachers and principals.

**Table 1. Gender Distribution Among Participating Beneficiaries**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
Farmers	16	29
DRR – Community Initiative groups	9	15
DRR – Village Emergency Group/Young Rescuers and Municipality Emergency Group	2	15
DRR – Reforestation		30
Environmental Education – Teachers and Directors	14	
Local Staff	7	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>93</b>

Source: Project Management Unit

Despite the above figures, the Project has achieved significant results in promoting women’s participation and empowerment. In addition to the growing number of women-farmers, the Evaluation has observed the prevalence of girls in eco-clubs, which have emerged as training grounds for potential leaders. Trainings, tools and financing provided to women farmers helped strengthen local women’s leadership and entrepreneurial capacities and community organization skills.

The Project has also engaged Internally Displaced Persons in the reforestation activities. Upon request from the Government of the Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia, 15 IDPs residing in Borjomi participated in the preparation of plots for reforestation and subsequent planting.

#### *Strengths and Limitations*

The Evaluation has identified several contributing factors, both positive and negative, which influenced the achievement of the Project results and may affect the long-term sustainability of the Project results.

According to the primary and secondary data, the Project has demonstrated significant strengths and assets, which have facilitated the implementation and has laid the basis for future development interventions in the region.

The main strength identified by the respondents and through the analysis of existing documentation was the *Project leadership*. The overwhelming majority of the respondents reiterated the role of the Project Manager, whose dedication, patience and diligence, as well as flexibility and strategic thinking was crucial for overcoming the initial strong resistance and indifference and determined the success of the Project. An important contributing factor to the success of the Project was the *synergy* between the Project Manager and project implementing partners, community mobilizers, and experts. In fact, the proximity to Project beneficiaries of the eco-clubs coordinator, who moved to Borjomi during the implementation, was considered essential for the engagement of schools and communities. Likewise, selection of key actors from the local and regional population (director of association Green Valley, managers, and coordinators of rural farmers' association, field coordinator) facilitated getting access to local populations and establishing cooperation.

The respondents credited the *participatory, consultative* nature of the Project and transparency of decision-making. According to the respondents, the Project Management planned each phase gradually, in consultation with the stakeholders and experts and took into account the interests and characteristics of the local populations, adapting the intervention to the local settings.

Likewise, the *UNDP Country Office* was credited for flexibility and availability, continuous administrative support and strategic guidance. Another factor of success was the flexibility, openness and strategic of the *donor Government*, which permitted the refocusing of the Project in the first place and ensured continuous support throughout the implementation.

Engagement of the *national and local governmental institutions* was particularly noted as one of the success criteria and potential guarantee of sustainability. Unlike the first phase of the intervention, where the Project encountered serious institutional obstacles, the current Project enjoyed relatively strong support from governmental counterparts, especially after the first results were presented. This engagement was manifested through in-kind and financial contributions, participation of the national and local governmental representatives in Project activities and gradually increasing ownership of the achieved results (see p. 31 - *Sustainability*). Borjomi municipality has been crucial in providing transportation from Borjomi to Daba and overall support to eco-clubs, IDPs working on

reforestation, farmers' association and infrastructure rehabilitation works. The management of Borjomi-Kharagauli National Park has also been supportive, inviting students to participate in ranger programmes and including them in their future workplans.

The engagement of stakeholders and beneficiaries has been due to another strength of the Project, namely the *effective communication and public outreach* strategy. The Project did not have a formal communication strategy document, but instead relied on short-term communication strategies, working closely with the UNDP Communication Officer. This collaboration allowed adapting the outreach and communication activities to the progress achieved in the implementation and targeting specific segments of population through media events, publications, celebrations, etc.

Despite the overall positive appraisal of the Project, the Evaluation has encountered a number of *exogenous* factors that affected the Project at different stages of its implementation. These factors (political and institutional context of the countries, its political and administrative system and institutional/resource capacities of stakeholders) posed challenges to the implementation and the sustainability of the Project.

The Evaluation identified the following *exogenous* limitations of the Project:

Overall institutional weaknesses and deficient legal frameworks were among the key challenges encountered by the Project. After the Government reform of 2011, the Forestry code had been rewritten and the existing draft had a strong emphasis on the commercial use of forests through long-time leasing. The Law of Georgia on Land Lease had been suspended in Samtskhe-Javakheti, which limited the growth potential of farmers' cooperatives<sup>19</sup>. The Law on Energy Efficiency does not exist. Currently, the Energy Efficiency Action Plan is being drafted but the prospects of its approval are low.

As mentioned on p. 17, the resistance of the Government, inherited from the previous phase of the Borjomi Initiative was a significant challenge at the beginning of the Project life, until the change of government and consequent institutional transformations. This reflects the overall weakness of the Georgian civil service, whereby changes in government usually result in sweeping changes in governmental institutions, often eroding institutional memory, affecting continuity and overall progress.

At the technical level, the most notable limitations were related to the limited access to trained human resources as the expertise in environmental management and in particular, forestry management had been decreasing in the recent years. The Forestry Institute, the traditional provider of key scientific knowledge, had been abolished and valuable technical expertise and information lost. In addition to specific technical knowledge, basic proposal-writing, budgeting, tourism and hotel management capacities are virtually non-existent in the beneficiary villages. Likewise, awareness of environmental protection, energy efficiency, sustainable use of resources and sanitary-hygiene norms is very low. Local populations are not acquainted with modern energy-efficiency and sanitation technologies, and often viewed them with suspicion. In general, local residents were less inclined to learn new mechanisms and skills for improving their livelihoods.

---

<sup>19</sup> By the time of the Evaluation, the Forestry Code had not been approved and was expected by the end of year 2015; The Law on Land Lease had been operational in Samtskhe-Javakheti.

The Evaluation did not encounter significant *endogenous* limitations, i.e. those related to corporate administrative and operational processes and norms, project design, resources. With the exception of one individual respondent and one respondent group, all respondents considered corporate processes adequate and propitious for implementation. Of those respondents, who expressed their criticism, the most notable was the criticism of two decisions: selection of wheat vs. potato for cultivation in Mzetamze and the approval procedures for co-financing percentages for guesthouse owners. The analysis of evidence did not support the expressed criticism. The decision to cultivate wheat in Mzetamtze had been taken on the basis of expert advice and the long-standing historical tradition in the village. The decision seemed to be approved by local farmers who considered that wheat better met their immediate needs for food and fodder.

The overall rating of the Project by the stakeholders was 4.9 on the scale of 1-5.

## CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are based on the analysis and triangulation of the Evaluation findings. The conclusions are organized according to the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability). The chapter also presents additional conclusions, which encompass wider aspects of the Project and cannot be limited to one single criterion. Finally, the chapter presents the comparison of the two phases of the Borjomi Initiative and conclusions on the potential impact of both.

The Evaluation concludes that in light of the complex political and legal settings, institutional shortcomings and initial local resistance, the UNDP Project - *Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment* – has been *successfully implemented and has achieved notable results with significant potential impact*. The Evaluation concludes that, considering the low initial baseline and the relatively short duration (3 years), the Project has achieved remarkable *positive and tangible change*, which is observable and largely measurable. The conclusions resonate with the overall positive rating of the Project by the respondents.

The Evaluation considers that the Project has been highly *relevant for Georgia* at the moment of the inception as it addressed complex social and economic issues in one of the vulnerable regions with relatively low economic activity, low community engagement and weak institutional structures. The social nature of the environmental intervention, linkages between environment and social vulnerability and the emphasis on improving livelihoods through sustainable management of environment has been innovative and catalytic. The experimental and scientific nature of the Project has permitted opening avenues for further exploration and piloting, while at the same time allowed identification of the most viable and potentially sustainable projects.

The Evaluation considers that the Project has been particularly *relevant for UNDP*, as it has piloted the systemic approach to complex development challenges in line with the provisions of the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2014-2017. It has also been *relevant for the UN family* at large, given its systemic, multi-disciplinary nature that encompasses different aspects of development and allows synergies between the UN system agencies. The Evaluation views the interventions of this type as an opportunity for exploring avenues for closer coordination and *delivering as one* in the host country.

The Evaluation considers that with the exception of a few small components, the Project has achieved high *effectiveness and efficiency* in the delivery of expected results. Moreover, the Project has exceeded the initial expectations and has obtained unplanned results with utmost efficiency and prudent use of available resources. UNDP has succeeded in transforming a problematic initiative on the verge of failure into an innovative and replicable pilot with significant potential impact and far-reaching results.

The Evaluation commends the Project Management for *exercising caution and patience* when engaging with complex stakeholders and relying on the scientific expertise and research when designing the intervention. In fact, the Evaluation agrees with a respondent, that with the exception of the GEF-funded projects, it is rare to see the level of scientific rigor used for the design and implementation of the entire intervention.

The Evaluation considers that *other factors of the success* include vigorous and well-executed communication strategy, consensus-building through the engagement of stakeholders in decision-making. The Project has opted for a flexible and gradual approach to planning instead of a rigid, “dogmatic” setting of the objectives and results. The Evaluation credits the UNDP senior management and the donor government for allowing such participatory approach and exercising appropriate flexibility in leadership and decision-making.

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has achieved *reasonable sustainability of the results*, with some components (forestry, sustainable farming, eco-clubs and informal environmental education) having higher sustainability prospects than others (energy-efficiency, tourist trails).

In general, the Evaluation considers that given the 3-year timeframe of the Project, its pilot nature and extremely low level of civism and environmental awareness in the target areas, it would have been *unrealistic* to expect high sustainability of results. In fact, no single project can be expected to obtain highly sustainable results in the environments with fragile institutional settings and civic activity. Instead, the Evaluation concludes that the Project has provided the beneficiaries with important *mechanisms for sustainability*, established resources, infrastructure, database and basic capacities to be used for future similar interventions in the region and has generated a body of scientific and practical knowledge that should be made available for wide use.

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has created a *solid base for replication* for UNDP proper as well as for national and international stakeholders. The Project has created a multi-component model that can be adapted and replicated in similar environments. The Evaluation considers that the groundwork done by the Project in preparation for the reforestation has paved the way for the Austrian Government and the Forestry Agency reforestation efforts in Borjomi region. Likewise, the Evaluation trusts that the infrastructure and capacities installed and institutionalized through the Rural Development Association will be an asset to future activities of ENPARD and other donor programmes in Samtskhe-Javakheti.

The Evaluation considers that UNDP and the Government of Finland are to be commended for their strategic vision when opting for the change of focus of the Project. While caused by exogenous factors, the decision to change the logic of intervention is considered as optimal and most likely to generate *significant impact* if accompanied with



steadfast support and ownership from the Government and communities and assistance from international community. The Evaluation coincides with the overwhelming majority of the respondents in concluding that out of the two phases of the Borjomi Initiative, the *current Project has been more strategic, innovative and sustainable in long-term.*

The Evaluation considers that even with the 100% achievement of the results the *Forest Ecosystem Restoration Project* and guaranteed future patronage from the Government, the long-term impact would have been insignificant if not accompanied with *a qualitative change in human behavior and perceptions.* Likewise, the sustainability of the forest restored under the Reforestation Project would have likely been jeopardized by illegal logging and grazing if not offset by alternative sources of income and strong institutional and legal frameworks and enforcement. The Evaluation considers that the only missing element that would have further enhanced the sustainability and the impact of the current Project was the *policy component* that would have targeted institutional deficiencies and barriers.

The Evaluation, therefore, concludes that the *most significant advance towards potential impact* was made through instigating awareness about the environment as an essential premise of human wellbeing and by piloting sustainable livelihoods models. The Project has succeeded in planting seeds of awareness and responsibility in the next generations, which is expected to adopt a more responsible attitude towards the environment and sustainable development in general. The Project has laid foundations for changing perceptions and behaviors and contributed to the enhancement of educational systems, as prerequisites for responsible attitude to the environment. The Project has also created the opportunities for employment and offered tools for increasing self-sufficiency and resilience. These elements are most likely to generate most sustainable and long-term future impact.

## CHAPTER 8. LESSONS LEARNED

The Evaluation identified a series of lessons learned in the process of Project implementation. Some of these lessons coincide with those identified through Project monitoring; others have been identified by the Evaluation through the analysis of the secondary data and interviews with the respondents.

1. In countries with fragile public administration systems, where senior civil servants are politically appointed, and the continuity of civil service is not guaranteed, successful innovative projects may be jeopardized by the absence of adequate legal and institutional infrastructure and political will. To ensure viability of successful pilots, it is important to simultaneously address the systemic challenges and provide policy support to key stakeholders;
2. While the Project had many protagonists, the most visible were the UNDP Country Office and the Forestry Agency. It is important that the profiles of the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Education be raised and publicized to underscore the full national ownership of the intervention and highlight the institutional commitment.
3. Communication is key to the success of projects with low public participation and awareness. It is difficult to obtain significant results without raising awareness at

- every level – from communities to teachers and principals to the highest executive offices. The overall success of the Project is directly linked with the consistent and well-targeted communication efforts, and the most successful components of the Project are those, where the educational and awareness component has been particularly consistent and effective;
4. Media capacities and awareness require particular attention and targeted training on sustainable development and environmental protection. Even the press-service of the Ministry of Environment requires comprehensive training on different aspects of sustainable development, including environmental management and protection, sustainable tourism and agriculture, sustainable forestry and the like;
  5. The most successful awareness and communications methods implied direct participation, such as door-to-door visits, community meetings, and talk-shows. Printed booklets are easier to be tossed away and are more easily forgotten. Other possible methods with high impact are social advertisements on local and national TV, broadcast during prime hours and programmes with highest ratings;
  6. There is very little culture of forest care and ownership in the population. Local residents, who reportedly watched burning forests without interfering, have been a very difficult target for the intervention implying behavioral change. For a meaningful shift in attitudes to occur, there needs to be a combination of attractive economical incentives, strong law enforcement, and continuous education that starts at early childhood stage.
  7. Engagement of scientists and sectorial expertise is essential for proper planning, cost effectiveness and eventual sustainability of projects of this nature. Scientific methods employed by the Project have been among the key factors of success and high sustainability of the forestry and agricultural components;
  8. Institutionalization of results is one of the prerequisites of sustainability. As in the case of farmer cooperatives and association as legal entities, sustainability of eco-clubs will increase if they have some legal status that would affiliate them with a national institution (Ministry of Environment and/or Education) and allow them to apply for grants.
  9. Farmers' cooperatives have stronger chances of prosperity and sustainability than individual small farmers. In addition to training and start-up support, it is important to link farmers with financing sources and state structures and help with market research and marketing strategies.
  10. Energy efficiency and bio-sanitary waste management are still new and need rigorous popularization, strong incentives and longer time for demonstration and awareness raising. Still, energy efficiency has more chances of interesting local populations than bio-sanitary measures, given that it is not labor intensive and the results and benefits are more visible. Meanwhile, benefits of bio-sanitary waste collectors are not immediately visible, while the GEL 1,000 average cost of a bio-waste collector is very high for average residents.

## CHAPTER 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Evaluation has formulated a series of recommendations regarding the potential niches of UNDP involvement and a number of practical tips for improving the design,

implementation and sustainability of future interventions. The recommendations were based on the findings of the Evaluation and referenced with the four evaluation criteria.

The Evaluation considers that UNDP Georgia can further increase the *relevance* of its interventions by testing and promoting innovative approaches that can have high social and economic impact. Given the strategic directions of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and the advances made by the Project, UNDP Georgia has a significant opportunity to pursue comprehensive multi-sectorial projects, which encompass some of the essential aspects of sustainable human development, identified in the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review: resilience, poverty, women's empowerment and gender equality and sustainable development.

To increase the *effectiveness and sustainability* of similar interventions, the Evaluation strongly suggests including policy components to contribute to the improvement of the enabling environment and to increase the odds of sustainability of the results. The Evaluation strongly recommends fostering stronger ties with the Ministry of Finance, Agriculture, Regional Development and Justice, to name a few, by engaging them in the design of the intervention and of the exit and sustainability strategies. The Evaluation also suggests further enhancing the visibility of the key national stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Environment Protection and Ministry of Education, to promote the national ownership of the Project and secure their unwavering support and participation.

Likewise, the Evaluation recommends the inclusion of capacity development and awareness raising activities for national stakeholders, such as line ministries and departments and municipal authorities. The Evaluation also considers it essential to include media in capacity development activities, providing specialized training for involved media outlets, including analysts, reporters and camera operators.

For increased *effectiveness* of interventions related to agriculture, the Evaluation recommends to continue providing technical assistance to link the beneficiaries with relevant national structures and potential financial sources, including donor agencies (e.g. ENPARD) and banks. Likewise, the Evaluation recommends continuing the successful practice of strengthening organizational capacities, including legal registration of organizations. To the extent possible, the Evaluation suggests exploring the possibility of legally registering the entities at the early stage of project implementation to allow longer time for developing organizational structures and links. The Evaluation highly recommends continuing the provision, where possible, of technical assistance and legal advice on issues related to land ownership, title rights, and insurance of land and equipment.

As a measure of future *efficiency and sustainability*, the Evaluation recommends using the trained beneficiaries as the human resource base for multidisciplinary programmes and projects of regional scope. Thus, the Rural Farmers' Association Green Valley can be used as a base for targeting local communities in the areas of disaster risk reduction, local area development, business incubators, and the like. Trained farmers and guesthouse owners, as well as eco-club members and school representatives, can be used as trainers and educators, for replicating the project model in other regions.

Likewise, to increase *the efficiency and effectiveness* of future similar interventions, the Evaluation recommends *increasing the involvement of the United Nations Country Team*

(UNCT) in comprehensive multi-disciplinary interventions of this type. This will foster the interagency cooperation and add value to UNDP work by complementing it with agency-specific competencies and strengths. The Evaluation considers that participation of such agencies as United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in the design and implementation of such initiatives can add value to DRR, education, and agricultural components, while the engagement of UNWOMEN would be particularly valuable for enhancing the gender equality component. To the extent possible, participation of specialized branches of UNEP, such as REDD and Poverty and Environment would be an additional asset for the environmental projects<sup>20</sup>.

Monitoring and Evaluation is essential for the *effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability* of interventions. While the Evaluation considers that the Project Management Unit carried out highly satisfactory monitoring of the Project, it is essential to carry out annual ex-post monitoring in the next 3-5 years to assess the real sustainability of the results and their impact. In the absence of the full-time Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in the Country Office to carry out ex-post monitoring of the results, the Evaluation recommends considering the inclusion of Project in the review of Environment and Energy Portfolio as part of the CPAP review (if carried out) or through monitoring of other projects of the Environment and Energy Team.

As a way of fostering the *relevance and effectiveness* of UNDP work, the Evaluation highly recommends systematization of the successful experiences and vast technical and methodological knowledge generated by the Project. As a unique experimental intervention with the significant rate of success and potential impact and thorough scientific approach, the Project can serve as a reference for UNDP, donor community and national stakeholders and highly reduce transaction costs of similar endeavors in the future. The experience has generated sufficient knowledge that can be consolidated in a form of a guide-book or a case study for dissemination to stakeholders and bemused for future *resource mobilization and replication*.

To improve the *effectiveness* of its work, the Evaluation recommends that UNDP improve the quality of project baselines, indicators and targets for more effective monitoring and measurement of change towards the results. The Evaluation does not recommend any particular type of indicators (qualitative, quantitative or proxy), however, the Team suggests that they follow the SMART criteria. The Evaluation also suggests using diverse sources for obtaining necessary baselines and targets, such as opinion surveys, statistical data, own assessments and reports (e.g. Rapid Rural Assessment), and the like.

## LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex 1. Evaluation Team’s Terms of Reference
- Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix
- Annex 3. List of Evaluation Respondents
- Annex 4. Data Sources and Bibliography

---

<sup>20</sup> The Project has extended invitations to some UN Agencies present in the country, however, there was low interest in participating in the Project. The Evaluation suggests using the good offices of the UN Resident Coordinator to engage the agencies from the start of the intervention.

Annex 5. Project Knowledge Products

Annex 6. Brief Biographies of the Evaluators

Annex 7. Evaluation Agenda

## Annex 1. Evaluation Team's Terms of Reference

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Project:** Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

**Position:** Terminal Evaluation Team Leader (International)

**Type of appointment:** Individual Contract

**Contract Duration:** September-October (18 working days)

**Estimated Starting Date of the assignment:** September, 2015

**Duty Station:** Home based work with one trip to Georgia, including Tbilisi for interviews and a field visit to the project target area

#### Background:

---

The project 'Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008' was initiated by the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources in order to mitigate the major impacts of forest fires caused by the armed conflict. The Government of Finland, in response to Georgian Prime Minister's appeal, had expressed its readiness to finance the project as a part of the pledge for post-conflict reconstruction, made at the Donor Conference in Brussels in autumn of 2008.

Following the above decision, the UNDP Country Office in Georgia, was sought as an implementing agency for the project by ENVSEC partners, and was requested to develop a full-fledged project proposal. The project document was developed and operations started in 2010 after approvals were received from the Ministry of Environment Protection (MoEP) and the Donor.

The project implementation was hampered due to the Government led reforms in environment sector in the beginning of 2011: the major structural changes, changes in the national priorities, change of the national counterpart, changing status of the main partner organisation.

As a result, UNDP Georgia in agreement with the Finnish Government, refocused the project towards supporting sustainable livelihoods, raising responsible attitude to environment and disaster risk reduction for the target villages, Daba and Tsagveri, affected by forest fires in August 2008.

After a series of consultation with the Finnish Government and National Counterpart (MoEP), the project was renamed: 'Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment'. The main objectives of the refocused project was to promote sustainable livelihoods, increase resilience against natural disasters and build responsible attitude to environment in the target villages of Borjomi municipality.

The refocused project started in April 2012. During its lifetime the project has been able to reduce risk of natural disasters and enhance resilience of local population through restoration of 60 ha of the damaged forest, engaging local workers and helping them to build their professional capacity;

the project promoted sustainable livelihoods through supporting income generation activities, demonstrating innovative approach and sustainable management of natural resources: bio farming, higher standard of rural tourism, energy efficiency and eco sanitation. Special attention was given to introducing informal environmental education at local schools, enhancing responsible attitude to environment, raising public interest, ownership and participation.

### Main Objectives:

Purpose of this terminal evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the ongoing Project<sup>1</sup> by assessing the project design, process of implementation, achievements against project objectives including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results. Terminal evaluation has three complementary purposes:

- To evaluate results and impacts, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability
- To suggest recommendations for replication of the project successes
- To document, provide feedback on and disseminate lessons learned

More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

#### Project concept and design

The evaluator(s) will assess the project concept and design. He/she will review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator(s) will assess the relevance of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

#### Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the evaluation is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

#### Project outputs, outcomes and potential impact

The evaluation will assess the achievement of outputs and contributions to outcomes as well as the sustainability of project results and potential impact. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original project 'Restoration of Ecosystems Damaged in Armed conflict in 2008' and the refocused one 'Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and responsible Attitude to Environment'

### Evaluation Methodology:

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following evaluation criteria:

- a. **Relevance** – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- b. **Effectiveness** – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- c. **Efficiency** – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- d. **Results** – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. Results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term potential impact including replication effects and other, local effects.
- e. **Sustainability** – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated on the following scale:

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Unsatisfactory (U):** The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for sustainability criteria, the evaluator should evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability” of outputs at project termination and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed.

#### ***Financial resources:***

- a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- b. What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available after the UNDP assistance (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

#### ***Socio-political:***

- a. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?



- b. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- c. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
- d. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?

***Institutional framework and governance:***

- a. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
- b. While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.

***Environmental:***

- a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:

- **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- **Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Finally, given the UNDP CO strategy to mainstream gender considerations in all its practice areas, it is recommended that the evaluators use the gender mainstreaming criteria and look at the project from the gender perspective.

The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodology and work plan for TE during the preparatory phase of the TE. The TE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review
- Interviews with major stakeholders and focus groups, including UNDP project implementing and executing agencies, government representatives, etc.
- Field visits to the project sites
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

**Scope of Work:**

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline (3 man/day);

## Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Briefing with UNDP CO/Project Management team, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report (1 man/day);
- Interviews with the project implementing partner/s and stakeholders, relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection/National Forest Agency, Sartichala Nursery, Ministry of Education and Science, Community College 'Opizari', OXFAM GB, Agriculture Cooperatives Development Agency, Eco Vision, project implementing Coordination group participant NGOs, donor representatives (3 man/days);
- Visit to the project site and interviews with beneficiaries and partners: Borjomi municipality, Tsagveri Farmers' Association, local farmers and entrepreneurs, Borjomi TV, participant school directors and eco clubs (2 man/days)
- Assess and validate results of the project in terms of achievements/gaps in delivering project outputs, contributing to UNDP programme Strategic Plan outcomes, reaching target beneficiaries, factors that affected results and the potential for sustainability (2 man/days)
- Debriefing with UNDP and project national counterpart to present findings of the TE (1 day);
- Development and submission of the draft TE report including lessons learned on substantive and project management issues and recommendations for replication (3 man/days). The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO and the Project Manager for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (3 man/days);
- The consultant will be expected to accomplish the above works in the agreed time frame and with high quality;

### Competencies:

- Integrity
- Ability to critically analyze issues, find root-causes and suggest optimum solutions;
- Ability to interact with a wide range of partners: government officials, development agencies, beneficiaries, etc.;
- Excellent team working and management skills;
- Strong interpersonal and communication skills, tact and negotiation skills, ability to cope with conflicting situations;
- Knowledge and understanding of UNDP or any other international corporate monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures;
- Ability to work independently with little or no supervision;
- Ability to submit evaluation reports in time.

### Qualifications and experience:

- Master's degree or equivalent in Natural Resources Management, Environment, Development Studies, M&E, Agriculture or related fields.
- At least 7 years of working experience in M&E of the international development projects for UN and/or other international agencies.

## Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Proven record of results-oriented monitoring and evaluation, knowledge of results-based management, proven knowledge of M&E tools, specificities and procedures.
- At least 5 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to international agencies, particularly related to sustainable livelihoods, DRR, environment protection/education projects or to other similar fields.
- Fluency in English both written and spoken and good technical writing skills.
- Knowledge of the CIS region, particularly Georgia's context will be an asset.
- Knowledge of Georgian will be an asset.
- E-literacy.

### Deliverables:

1. Detailed TE methodology and outline, including tools for qualitative and quantitative analysis, questionnaire/s for interviews by 18 September 2015
2. Detailed TE action plan by 25 September 2015
3. Draft TE Report by 21 October
4. Final TE Report including recommendations for replication of success by 5 November.

### Timeframe:

It is expected that the evaluation will be accomplished no later than 13 November 2015, over a period of maximum 18 working days by the Evaluation team. The Evaluation Team consists of an international consultant/Team Leader and a national consultant/Team Member.

### Contract Type, Payment Modality and Duration:

The Terminal Evaluation Team Leader will be recruited under Individual Contract (IC) for 2 months, from 14 September 2015 till 13 November 2015. The payments will be made as per the agreed schedule and upon clearance and acceptance by UNDP of deliverables.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Project:** Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

**Position:** Terminal Evaluation Team Member (National Consultant)

**Type of appointment:** Individual Contract

**Contract Duration:** September-October (15 working days)

**Estimated Starting Date of the assignment:** September, 2015

**Duty Station:** Home based work with one trip to the project target area Borjomi and Tsagveri

### Background:

---

The project 'Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in 2008' was initiated by the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources in order to mitigate the major impacts of forest fires caused by the armed conflict. The Government of Finland, in response to Georgian Prime Minister's appeal, had expressed its readiness to finance the project as a part of the pledge for post-conflict reconstruction, made at the Donor Conference in Brussels in autumn of 2008.

Following the above decision, the UNDP Country Office in Georgia, was sought as an implementing agency for the project by ENVSEC partners, and was requested to develop a full-fledged project proposal. The project document was developed and operations started in 2010 after approvals were received from the Ministry of Environment Protection (MoEP) and the Donor.

The project implementation was hampered due to the Government led reforms in environment sector in the beginning of 2011: the major structural changes, changes in the national priorities, change of the national counterpart, changing status of the main partner organisation.

As a result, UNDP Georgia in agreement with the Finnish Government, refocused the project towards supporting sustainable livelihoods, raising responsible attitude to environment and disaster risk reduction for the target villages, Daba and Tsagveri, affected by forest fires in August 2008.

After a series of consultation with the Finnish Government and National Counterpart (MoEP), the project was renamed: 'Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment'. The main objectives of the refocused project was to promote sustainable livelihoods, increase resilience against natural disasters and build responsible attitude to environment in the target villages of Borjomi municipality.

The refocused project started in April 2012. During its lifetime the project has been able to reduce risk of natural disasters and enhance resilience of local population through restoration of 60 ha of the damaged forest, engaging local workers and helping them to build their professional capacity; the project promoted sustainable livelihoods through supporting income generation activities, demonstrating innovative approach and sustainable management of natural resources: bio farming, higher standard of rural tourism, energy efficiency and eco sanitation. Special attention was given

to introducing informal environmental education at local schools, enhancing responsible attitude to environment, raising public interest, ownership and participation.

### Main Objectives:

Purpose of this terminal evaluation is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the completed Project<sup>2</sup> by assessing the project design, process of implementation, achievements against project objectives including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results. Terminal evaluation has three complementary purposes:

- To evaluate results and impacts, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability
- To suggest recommendations for replication of the project successes
- To document, provide feedback on and disseminate lessons learned

More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

#### Project concept and design

The evaluator(s) will assess the project concept and design. He/she will review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator(s) will assess the relevance of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

#### Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular the evaluation is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation.

#### Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

### Evaluation Methodology:

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following evaluation criteria:

---

<sup>2</sup> The original project 'Restoration of Ecosystems Damaged in Armed conflict in 2008' and the refocused one 'Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and responsible Attitude to Environment'

- a. **Relevance** – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- b. **Effectiveness** – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- c. **Efficiency** – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- d. **Results/impacts** – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. Results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including replication effects and other, local effects.
- e. **Sustainability** – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated on the following scale:

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Unsatisfactory (U):** The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for sustainability criteria, the evaluator should evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability” of outcomes at project termination and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed.

***Financial resources:***

- a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- b. What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available after the UNDP assistance (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

***Socio-political:***

- a. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
- b. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- c. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?

d. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?

***Institutional framework and governance:***

- a. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
- b. While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.

***Environmental:***

- a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:

- **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- **Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Finally, given the UNDP CO strategy to mainstream gender considerations in all its practice areas, it is recommended that the evaluators use the gender mainstreaming criteria and look at the project from the gender perspective.

The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodology and work plan for TE during the preparatory phase of the TE. The TE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review
- Interviews with major stakeholders and focus groups, including UNDP/GEF project implementing and executing agencies, government representatives, etc.
- Field visits to the project sites
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

**Scope of Work:**

- Work together with the Team Leader to develop the Terminal Evaluation (TE) detailed work plan and TE outline (2 man/days);
- Obtain the relevant documentation for the desk review (1 man/day);
- Produce a list of main stakeholders and partners, organize interviews in Tbilisi, Borjomi and Tsagveri (2 man/days);
- Make sure accurate data is obtained, database is created and used to analyse qualitative and quantitative information, as appropriate (5 man/days);

## Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Visit the project site together with the TE Team Leader, assist him/her in obtaining and inputting data, reviewing documents (2 man/days);
- Participate in developing and submitting draft and final TE reports (3man/days).

### Competencies:

- Integrity
- Excellent team working skills
- Good communication skills, ability to work with a wide range of partners
- Strong organizational skills, ability to work without delay
- Ability to critically analyze issues
- Good knowledge of sustainable development issues in Georgia
- Ability to submit evaluation reports in time
- At least 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the sustainable livelihoods, DRR and/or environment for sustainable development driven projects
- Sound knowledge of results-oriented monitoring and evaluation and results-based management, proven Knowledge of M&E tools, specificities and procedures
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating projects with diverse interrelated components for UN or other international development agencies
- Knowledge of the CIS region, particularly Georgia's context
- Fluency in English both written and spoken
- E-literacy, good technical and writing skills

### Qualification and experience:

- Bachelor's degree in Natural Resources Management, Environment Awareness and Education, Forest, Agriculture or related fields
- Knowledge of M&E technical specifications and procedures, at least 5 years of experience in organizing and managing M&E process
- Experienced in assessment and analysis of international development projects, particularly related to sustainable livelihoods, DRR, environment protection/education
- Proven record providing evaluation reports of high quality
- Fluency in English and Georgian: written and spoken;
- E-literacy

### Deliverables:

5. TE methodology and outline, including tools for qualitative and quantitative analysis, questionnaire/s for interviews by 18 September 2015
6. TE detailed action plan by 25 September 2015
7. Draft TE Report by 21 October
8. Final TE Report including recommendations for replication of success by 5 November.



\_\_\_\_\_ Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude \_\_\_\_\_  
to Environment

**Timeframe:**

It is expected that the evaluation will be accomplished no later than 13 November 2015, over a period of maximum 33 working days by the Evaluation Team (18 days Team Leader, 15 days Team Member). The Evaluation Team consists of an international consultant/Team Leader and a national consultant/Team Member.

**Contract Type, Payment Modality and Duration:**

The Terminal Evaluation Team Member will be recruited under Individual Contract (IC) for 2 months, from 14 September 2015 till 13 November 2015. The payments will be made as per the agreed schedule and upon clearance and acceptance of deliverables by UNDP.

**Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix and Rating Scale for Indicative Questions**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Key Questions</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>	<b>Data Collection Methodology and Tools</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Quantitative Rating Scale</b>	<b>Data Analysis methods</b>
<b>Relevance</b>	Has the Project been relevant at national/local levels at the moment of its design?	Project, stakeholders, beneficiaries	Project document, reports, specialized studies and assessments, lessons learned  Interviews, Focus groups, observations.	Average of positive responses form the total number  Respondents' testimonials	1 - Not adequate/relevant/catalytic/clear	Qualitative/Quantitative
	Is the project still relevant in a political and social context that has evolved since the start of the project?				2 – Somewhat adequate/relevant/catalytic/clear	
	What is the value added of the Project?				3 – Moderately adequate/relevant/catalytic/clear	
	Has the Project design been adequate?				4 – Adequate/relevant/catalytic/clear	
	Has the logic of intervention been adequate?				5 – Very adequate/relevant/catalytic/clear	
	Are the Project interventions, activities, adequate and lead to the results?					
	Was the Project innovative and catalytic? How?					
	Does the Project				1 – Not aligned/does not respond	

	<p>respond to the priorities of the country? How?</p>				<p>2 – Somewhat aligned/responds                  3 – Moderately well aligned/responds moderately well                  4 – Well aligned/responds well                  5 – very well aligned/responds very well</p>	
	<p>Does the Project respond to the necessities of beneficiaries?</p>				<p>1 - Not adequate/relevant                  2 – Somewhat adequate/relevant                  3 – Moderately adequate/relevant                  4 - Adequate/relevant/                  5 – Very adequate/relevant</p>	
	<p>Is the project aligned with national strategies and UNDP's mandate and priorities?</p>				<p>1 – Does not reflect                  2 – Somewhat reflects                  3 – Moderately reflects                  4 – Reflects well                  5 – Reflects very well</p>	
	<p>Have the strategic alliances been relevant and adequate for the achievement of results?</p>				<p>1 - Not appropriate                  2 – Somewhat appropriate                  3 - Moderately appropriate</p>	
	<p>To what extent is UNDP's engagement reflects strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in this particular development context and its comparative advantage, particularly in EP/DRR?</p>					
	<p>To what extent was the project's design and selected method of delivery appropriate to</p>					

	the development context and needs of relevant beneficiaries?				4 - Appropriate 5 - Very appropriate	
	How can the Project become more relevant to the current context, both institutional and corporate (UNDP)?					Qualitative
<b>Effectiveness/Results</b>	Has the progress towards achievement of outputs been steady and according to the plan?	Project, stakeholders, beneficiaries	Project document, reports, lessons learned  Interviews, Focus groups, observations.	Indicators and targets  Average of positive responses form the total number	1 – Not steady 2 – Somewhat steady 3 – Moderately steady 4 - Steady 5 – Very steady	Qualitative/Quantitative
	To what extent have expected outputs been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement? What factors influenced this? What are project’s primary results to date?				1 – Not achieved 2 – Somewhat achieved 3 – Partially achieved 4 – Mostly achieved 5 – Fully achieved	
	Which factors have contributed to the achievement and non-achievement of results?					
	How has the project contributed to outcome level changes? Did it at least set dynamic				1 – Not at all 2 – Somewhat well 3 – Moderately well	

	changes and processes that move towards the long-term outcomes?				4 – Well 5 – Very well	
	Is the change in the outputs measurable? Positive? If negative, why?				Yes/no	Quantitative/qualitative
	Are institutional arrangements adequate and effective for the achievement of the outputs?				1 – Not adequate/effective 2 – Somewhat adequate/effective 3 – Moderately adequate/effective 4 - Adequate/effective 5 – Very adequate/effective	Qualitative/Quantitative
	Did the institutional arrangements between UNDP CO and national/local Governments adequately allow for the achievement of the outputs?				1 – Did not allow 2 – Somewhat allowed 3 – Moderately allowed 4 – Allowed 5 – Very well allowed	
	To what degree have key stakeholders, including UNDP, national and local counterparts participated in the Project and what is the level of satisfaction with partnership strategy, programmatic process				1 – Did not participate 2 – Somewhat participated 3 – Moderately participated 4 – Well participated 5 – Very well participated	

	and results?				1 - Not satisfied 2 – Somewhat satisfied 3 – Moderately satisfied 4 – Satisfied 5 - Very satisfied	
	Has there been sufficient level of Government/community buy-in and ownership?				1 – Insufficient 2 – Somewhat sufficient 3 – Moderately sufficient 4 – Sufficient 5 - Very Sufficient	
	What has been the contribution of partner organizations, especially beneficiary institutions, to the outcome, and how effective have been the project partnerships in contributing to achieving the outcome?					Qualitative
	Did the Project have unplanned results?				Yes/no	
<b>Efficiency</b>	Have the financial and human resources been sufficient to achieve the outputs	Project, stakeholders, beneficiaries	Project Document, Budget, AWP, Financial reports (CDR), audit	Indicators and targets  Average of positive responses form	1 – Insufficient 2 – Somewhat sufficient 3 – Moderately sufficient 4 – Sufficient	Qualitative/Quantitative

			reports (if any)	the total number	5 - Very Sufficient	
	Has the project been implemented within deadline and cost estimates? Were the actions taken to solve implementation issues efficient?			Delivery information	Yes/no	
	Have the resources been used efficiently?				1 – Inefficiently 2 – Somewhat efficiently 3 – Moderately efficiently 4 – Efficiently 5 - Very Efficiently	Qualitative/Quantitative
	Did the project M&E systems and practices allow for in-time corrective actions and tracking of the progress towards the expected results (outputs, contributions to the outcomes)?				Yes/no	Qualitative
	Did the Project ensure adequate coordination with other similar projects, especially in terms of pooling available resources for greater efficiency?				Yes/no	Qualitative

	Has the resource mobilization strategy been successful?				<p>1 - Unsuccessful</p> <p>2 – Somewhat successful</p> <p>3 – Moderately successful</p> <p>4 – Successful</p> <p>5 - Very successful</p>	Qualitative/quantitative
<b>Sustainability</b>	Is the project sustainable?	Project, stakeholders, beneficiaries	Project document, reports, lessons learned	Average of positive responses form the total number	<p>1 - Unsustainable</p> <p>2 – Somewhat sustainable</p> <p>3 – Moderately sustainable</p> <p>4 – Sustainable</p> <p>5 - Very sustainable</p>	Qualitative/Quantitative
	What indications are there that the achieved results (primarily at output level) will be sustained, e.g. through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?					Qualitative
	To what extent has a sustainability strategy, particularly at local level, been developed or implemented?				<p>1 – Not at all developed</p> <p>2 – Somewhat well developed</p> <p>3 – Moderately well developed</p> <p>4 – Well developed</p> <p>5 – Very well developed</p>	Qualitative/quantitative
	Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the				Yes/no	Qualitative



	sustenance of Project Outcomes? Which?					
	What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available after the UNDP assistance?					Qualitative
	Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Which?				Yes/no	Qualitative
	Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?					
	Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?					
	Within the stakeholders, to what extent do the various institutions feel an ownership of this Project? What strategies could have been used to increase buy-in?					1 – Insufficient 2 – Somewhat sufficient 3 – Moderately sufficient 4 – Sufficient 5 - Very Sufficient

	What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?				1 - None 2 - Low 3 - Moderate 4 - High 5 - Very high	Quantitative/qualitative
	Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?				Yes/no	Qualitative
	Are the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how in place?				Yes/no	Qualitative
	Is there an adequate exit strategy?				Yes/no	Qualitative
	Are financial, organizational and economic mechanisms adequate to achieve sustainability of project results?				1 - Not adequate 2 - Somewhat adequate 3 - Moderately adequate 4 - Adequate 5 - Very adequate	Quantitative
	Is there sufficient national and local				1 - Insufficient	Qualitative/quantitative

	institutional capacity to ensure the continuity and sustainability of project outputs?				2 – Somewhat sufficient 3 – Moderately sufficient 4 – Sufficient 5 - Very Sufficient	
	Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?				Yes/no 1 - None 2 – Low 3 - Moderate 4 - High 5 – Very high	Qualitative/quantitative
	Did the Project consider the experiences and lessons learned from the implementation of this and other similar projects for greater sustainability? How?					
<b>Gender Mainstreaming</b>	Did interventions take gender equality into consideration? How?	Project, stakeholders, beneficiaries	Project document, reports, lessons learned	Average of positive responses form the total number	1 – Did not contribute 2 – Somewhat contributed 3 – Moderately contributed 4 – Well contributed 5 – Very well contributed	Qualitative/Quantitative
	Did the project contribute to changes in gender gaps or the situation of vulnerable groups? How?					
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	Which were the key lessons learned of the	Project, stakeholders,	Project document,			Qualitative

	Project?	beneficiaries	reports, lessons learned			
	What lessons learned and best practices can be captured that could be applicable to similar Projects?					

### Annex 3. List of Evaluation Respondents

#	Person	Position	Category	Contact
1	Mr. Shombi Sharp	UNDP Deputy Resident Representative	UNDP corporate/ Project Management	(995) 577 330 033 <a href="mailto:shombi.sharp@undp.org">shombi.sharp@undp.org</a>
2	Ms. Natia Natsvlishvili	Assistant Resident Representative		<a href="mailto:natia.natsvlishvili@undp.org">natia.natsvlishvili@undp.org</a>
3	Ms. Nino Antadze	Energy and Environment Team Leader		(995) 599 093989 <a href="mailto:nino.antadze@undp.org">nino.antadze@undp.org</a>
4	Ms. Nestan Khuntsaria	Programme Associate		(995) 599700255 <a href="mailto:nestan.khuntsaria@undp.org">nestan.khuntsaria@undp.org</a>
5	Ms. Sopho Tchichinadze	Head of PR Department		<a href="mailto:sophie.tchichinadze@undp.org">sophie.tchichinadze@undp.org</a>
6	Ms. Lali Meskhi	Project Manager		(995) 599 539003 <a href="mailto:asmat.lali.meskhi@undp.org">asmat.lali.meskhi@undp.org</a>
7	Ms. Ketevan Ann Cheishvili	Project Assistant		(995) 599 101909 <a href="mailto:Ketevan.Cheishvili@undp.org">Ketevan.Cheishvili@undp.org</a>
8	Dr. Merab Machavariani	Project Manager in 2010-2011		(995) 599 571588 <a href="mailto:biodiv@caucasus.net">biodiv@caucasus.net</a>
9	Ms. Mariam Shotadze	Energy and Environment Team Leader in 2010		(995) 593 328446
10	Ms. Sophia Kemkhadze	Assistant Resident Representative in 2010-2013, UNDP Georgia		<a href="mailto:Sophie.kemkhadze@undp.org">Sophie.kemkhadze@undp.org</a>
11	Ms. Khatuna Gogaladze	Minister of Environment and Natural Resources Protection (MENRP) in 2012-2014	Implementing Partner	(995) 599 800307 <a href="mailto:Kh_gogaladze@yahoo.com">Kh_gogaladze@yahoo.com</a>
12	Ms. Nino Sharashidze	Deputy Minister of Environment and Natural Resources Protection (MENRP) in 2012-2014		(995) 599 959598
13	Ms. Inga Nikagosian	PR, MENRP in 2012-2014		(995) 577 293979 <a href="mailto:inganikagosian@gmail.com">inganikagosian@gmail.com</a>
14	Mr. Giorgi Zedgenidze	Former Deputy Minister in January – October, 2012, MENRP		(995) 599 171191
15	Ms. Marika Valishvili	Deputy Minister of Energy	Implementing Partner	(995) 577 960505
16	Mr. Karlo Amirgulashvili	Head of the forest Policy Unit, MERP		(995) 591 819613 <a href="mailto:k.amirgulashvili@moe.gov.ge">k.amirgulashvili@moe.gov.ge</a>
17	Ms. Natia Iordanishvili	Head of Forest Restoration Unit, National Forestry Agency (NFA), MENRP		(995) 595 300991 <a href="mailto:n.iordanishvili@anr.ge">n.iordanishvili@anr.ge</a>

18	Ms. Marina Sujashvili	Deputy Head of Forest Restoration Unit, National Forestry Agency (NFA),		<a href="mailto:n.jordanishvili@yahoo.com">n.jordanishvili@yahoo.com</a> (955) 595 300992
19	Mr. Soso Pitskhelauri	Forest Restoration Project Coordinator, National Forestry Agency (NFA),		(955) 599280809 <a href="mailto:pitskhelauris@yahoo.de">pitskhelauris@yahoo.de</a>
20	Mr. Revaz Bejashvili	Director of Sartichala Nursery, MENRP		(955) 592 339399 <a href="mailto:rezobeja@gmail.com">rezobeja@gmail.com</a>
21	Mr. Avtandil Mikaberidze	Forest Specialist, APA		(955) 577 101898 <a href="mailto:a.mikaberidze1@gmail.com">a.mikaberidze1@gmail.com</a>
22	Ms. Nato Sultanishvili	Head of LEPL Environmental Education Department, MENRP		(955) 595 999908 <a href="mailto:natosultanishvili@gmail.com">natosultanishvili@gmail.com</a>
23	Ms. Rusudan Tevzadze	National Curriculum and General Education Development Department, Ministry of Education		(955) 577 435272 <a href="mailto:ruskatevzadze@yahoo.com">ruskatevzadze@yahoo.com</a>
24	Mr. Dimitry Beridze	Gamebeli of Borjomi in 2014		(955) 599700222 <a href="mailto:ditoberidze@gmail.com">ditoberidze@gmail.com</a>
25	Mr. Anzor Svanidze	First Deputy Gamebeli, Borjomi Municipality Governance		(955)596095000 <a href="mailto:anzorsvanidze1985@gmail.com">anzorsvanidze1985@gmail.com</a>
26	Mr. Giorgi Datusani	Humanitarian Programme Officer, Oxfam		(955) 599 513262 <a href="mailto:gdatusani@oxfam.org.uk">gdatusani@oxfam.org.uk</a>
27	Mr. Tamaz Dundua	Project manager, support and training of local farmers, repair of guesthouses, NGO “Elkana”		(955) 595 95 33 77 <a href="mailto:manager@elkana.org.ge">manager@elkana.org.ge</a>
28	Ms. Nana Kartvelishvili	Project Coordinator, NGO “Elkana”		(955) 597 275075 <a href="mailto:ruraltourism@elkana.org.ge">ruraltourism@elkana.org.ge</a>
29	Ms. Manana Gigauri	Organizational Development, NGO “Elkana”		(955) 2 536486 <a href="mailto:publications@elkana.org.ge">publications@elkana.org.ge</a>
30	Ms. Irina Japaridze	Executive Director, EcoVision		(955) 574 738871 <a href="mailto:info@ecovision.ge">info@ecovision.ge</a> <a href="mailto:Georgia@spareworld.org">Georgia@spareworld.org</a>
31	Mr. Giorgi Magradze	Greens Movement of Georgia, Program Manager		(955) 599 244632 <a href="mailto:magio7@gmail.com">magio7@gmail.com</a>
32	Mr. Giorgi Lebanidze	Sustainable Management of Biodiversity, South Caucasus (GIZ)	Implementing Partner	(955) 599 271807 <a href="mailto:Giorgi.lebanidze@giz.de">Giorgi.lebanidze@giz.de</a>
33	Ms. Ana Inasaridze	Environmental Projects Coordinator, CENN		(955) 593 924844 <a href="mailto:nino.gaprindashvili@cenn.org">nino.gaprindashvili@cenn.org</a>
34	Ms. Manana Ratiani	Consultant, Teachers Professional Development Centre		(955) 577 555216 <a href="mailto:ratianimanana@hotmail.com">ratianimanana@hotmail.com</a>

35	Ms. Eto Jincharadze	Eco-Clubs Coordinator		(995) 574 738771 <a href="mailto:eto.jincharadze@yahoo.de">eto.jincharadze@yahoo.de</a>
36	Ms. Lali Goginava	Expert in Berry and Fruit		(995) 595 555 560 <a href="mailto:lgoginava@mail.ru">lgoginava@mail.ru</a>
37	Mr. Irakli Rekhviashvili	Expert in Forage Production		(995) 599 729 875 (995) 555 251 965 <a href="mailto:ir.rekh@gmail.com">ir.rekh@gmail.com</a>
38	Ms. Nino Gamisonia	Expert in Eco-sanitation		(995) 599 548 292 (995) 593 001 778 <a href="mailto:n.gamisonia@gmail.com">n.gamisonia@gmail.com</a>
39	Ms. Liana Garibashvili	Expert in Energy Efficiency		(995) 599 548 782 <a href="mailto:l_gari@eecgeo.org">l_gari@eecgeo.org</a>
40	Mr. Zviad Beglarishvili	Expert in Tourism (making of hiking trails)		(995) 595 309100 <a href="mailto:z.beglarishvili@geoland.ge">z.beglarishvili@geoland.ge</a>
41	Ms. Bela Avalishvili,	Director, LEPL Community college “Opizari” – support and training of local farmers, demonstration projects, vet laboratory		(995) 599 172 005 <a href="mailto:belaavalishvili@gmail.com">belaavalishvili@gmail.com</a>
42	Ms. Nana Zubashvili	Field Coordinator		(995) 595 451 911 <a href="mailto:nana.zubashvili@gmail.com">nana.zubashvili@gmail.com</a>
43	Ms. Irma Magradze	Farmer in Daba/Head of Daba cooperative		(995) 595 940 012
44	Ms. Khatuna Inasaridze	Farmer in Timotesubani		(995) 598 378 681
45	Mr. Lasha Paksashvili	Guest house owner	(995) 595 964 603	
46	Ms. Eka Tabatadze	Guest house owner		
47	Mr. Jambul Gelashvili	Owner of the Guest House “Tsagveri Lodge”	(995) 593 932627	
48	Ms. Marina Tsitsadze	Owner of the Guest House “Tsagveri Lodge”	(995) 593 932627	
49	Ms. Dali Qasashvili	Farmer/Demo project of Solar water heaters and eco toilets	(995) 599 329 085	
50	Ms. Maka Gongadze	Head of association/Director since June 2015	(995) 598 267 247 <a href="mailto:makagongadze1983@gmail.com">makagongadze1983@gmail.com</a>	
51	Mr. Alexander Zarnadze	Manager of Rural Farmers Association	(995) 593 473 699 <a href="mailto:leqso.zarnadze@gmail.com">leqso.zarnadze@gmail.com</a>	
52	Mr. Merab Tediashvili	Forest guard from Village Daba		
53	Mr. Mikheil Tediashvili	Villager participated in forest restorations, Village Daba	(995) 555 105 692	

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

54	Ms. Marina Kupatadze	Director, TV Borjomi		(995) 593 622 225 <a href="mailto:marinatvb@gmail.com">marinatvb@gmail.com</a>
55	Ms. Nino Vartapetiani	Journalist, TV Borjomi		(995) 593 693 162 <a href="mailto:ninoTVB@gmail.com">ninoTVB@gmail.com</a>
56	Ms. Julieta Jinjolava	Director of Borjomi School 1		(995) 599112192 <a href="mailto:borjomi1@mes.gov.ge">borjomi1@mes.gov.ge</a>
57	Ms. Mariam Dadiani	Eco-club member, Borjomi School 1		-
58	Ms. Nia Datunishvili	Eco-club member, Borjomi School 1		-
59	Ms. Khatuna Kharazashvili	Director of Borjomi School 3		(995) 595551136 <a href="mailto:borjomi3@mes.gov.ge">borjomi3@mes.gov.ge</a>
60	Ms. Lika Gogoladze	Eco-club member, Borjomi School 3		-
61	Mr. Alexi Velashvili	Eco-club member, Borjomi School 3		-
62	Ms. Ledi Solomonidze	Deputy Director, Borjomi School 4		<a href="mailto:borjomi4@mes.gov.ge">borjomi4@mes.gov.ge</a>
63	Ms. Marine Peradze	Teacher at Eco-Club, Borjomi School 4		(995) 595727604
64	Ms. Ana Gvirjishvili	Eco-club member, Borjomi School 4		-
65	Ms. Natia Tugushi –	Eco-club member, Borjomi School 4		-
66	Mr. Petri Salo	Former Finnish Ambassador		Other <a href="mailto:Petri.Salo@formin.fi">Petri.Salo@formin.fi</a>
67	Mr. Christer Michelsson	Current Finnish Ambassador		
68	Ms. Ketu Metreveli	ADA Project Coordinator	(995) 599 117895	



#### Annex 4. Data Sources and Bibliography

1. AG International Consulting, 2015. LEPL NFA Capacity assessment.
2. Amendment to Cost-Sharing Agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (the donor) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 4 September 2012
3. Cheishvili K.A, Capacity Assessment of OXFAM GB.
4. Cheishvili K.A, Capacity Assessment of Biological Farming Association “Elkana”.
5. Cost-Sharing Agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (the donor) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 28 April, 2010
6. Drat Forest Code, 23 February, 2012
7. Eco-club Strategic Plan 2015-2017 – Environmental Education as a Guarantee for Sustainable Development
8. Eco-Clubs Exit Strategy, Project Closure Plan, 2015
9. Ecovision, September, 2011. Initial Rural Needs Assessment Report for Consultancy Services for Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities.
10. Ecovision, September, 2011. Socio-Economic and Livelihood Assessment Report for Consultancy Services for Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities.
11. Ecovision, October, 2011. Public Awareness Report including recommendations for public outreach actions.
12. Ecovision, November, 2011. Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities.
13. Environmental Education for Sustainability: National Strategy and Action Plan for 2012-2014.
14. Extension letters (Extension letter from UNDP, 29 August, 2014; Reply to extension letter, 10 September, 2014; Confirmation on extension, 16 September, 2014).
15. Georgian Technical University, 2010. Hydrogeological and geological engineering report
16. Georgian Technical University, 2010. Nursery hydrogeological report.
17. Gigauri G, February, 2011. Erosion Control Measures and Recommendations (*in Georgian*).
18. Gigauri G, December, 2010. Afforestation Plan (*in Georgian*).
19. Gigauri G, March, 2011. Nursery Plan (*in Georgian*).
20. Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, *World Bank*
21. Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results, *UNDP*
22. Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Program Evaluation, (with Michael Woolcock), in Francois Bourgingnon and Luiz Pereira Da Silva (edited) *Tool Kit for Evaluating the Poverty and Distributional Impact of Economic Policies*, World Bank and Oxford University Press, 2003
23. Ludwig R, 2011. Mission Report 19 Sept, 2010: “International Consultant on project GIS forest Inventory, ecosystem monitoring”.
24. Ludwig R, 2010. Mission Report 29 Nov, 2010: “International Consultant on project GIS forest Inventory, ecosystem monitoring”.
25. Ludwig R, 2011. Draft Monitoring Guidelines: “International Consultant on project GIS forest

Inventory, ecosystem monitoring”.

26. Mikaberidze A, 2013. Forest restoration plan 2013.
27. Mikaberidze A, 2014. Forest restoration plan 2014.
28. Multitest, 2011. Nursery soil analysis report.
29. Namoradze T, March, 2011. Nursery Construction Plans (Engineering schemes , Cost-Estimations).
30. National Forestry Agency. Young Forester’s Manual (a text book for vocational education and eco-clubs).
31. OXFAM GB report DRR including: assessment of vulnerability and capacity of the target four villages, DRR profiles of the target villages with disaster risks defined and small mitigation projects formulated
32. Shamugia I, 2011. Capacity assessment for the LEPL Agency for Natural Resources and Basic Sapling Forestry
33. Suess W, 2010. Inception Report of the International Project Monitoring Technical Adviser Restoration.
34. Tavadze B and Supatashvili A, 2011. Pathological Survey/Study of the project area of about 400 ha and surrounding healthy forest in Borjomi District. *Report by Association of Protection of a Nature and Historical Values of Georgia “Phesvebi”*
35. The legislative amendments of the law about the “environmental protection”, March 2012
36. Zviadaze U, 2010. Report on geological assessment of the project area, engineering constructions and bio-engineering techniques (*in Georgian*).
37. Project Document “Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia”, 2010.
38. Project Document “Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment”, 2011.
39. CDRs (CDR-2010, CDR-2011, CDR-2012, CDR-2013, CDR-2014).
40. Project Executive Board Meeting Minutes.
  - PEB Minutes, 10 April, 2012
  - PEB Minutes, July 20, 2012
  - PEB Minutes, October 17, 2012
  - PEB Minutes, February 28, 2013
  - PEB Minutes, June 26, 2013
  - PEB Minutes, November 12, 2013
  - PEB Minutes, February 12, 2014
  - PEB Minutes, July 10, 2014
  - PEB Minutes, 28 May, 2015
41. Quarterly and Annual reports.
  - Project Progress report and Plan, 24 October, 2011
  - First Quarter Progress Report, April-June, 2012
  - Second Quarter Progress Report, July-September, 2012
  - Third quarter Progress Report, October – December 2012
  - Progress report for the period of January – May 2013, 4 June 2013

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Progress report for the period of June - September 2013, 21 October 2013
  - Annual Progress report for April 2010 – June 2011, 21 July, 2011
  - Annual Progress report for 2013, February 2014
  - Progress Report for the period of January – June 2014, July 2014
  - Annual Progress Report for 2014, February 2015
  - Brief on Results of the UNDP project Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment 2012-2015, 28 May, 2015
  - Project chronology 2009-2011
  - Project Chronology 2012
42. Trip reports.
- a) *Trip Reports 2012-2013*
- 1- 2 May 2012-Trip report for Borjomi and Tsagveri, 4 May 2012
  - 9-12 May 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, 14 May, 2012
  - 20-22 June 2012-Trip report for Akhaltsikhe, Borjomi, Tsagveri, 25 June, 2012
  - 17-20 July, 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri 23 July, 2012
  - 8-10 August 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri, 13 August, 2012
  - 26-28 September 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri, September, 2012
  - 16-17 October, 2012 Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri, October, 2012
  - Agenda for Trip Borjomi Tsagveri Akhaldaba, 6-7 December 2012
  - Visit Agenda to Tsagveri and Borjomi 7-9 August 2013
  - Visit Agenda to Tsagveri and Borjomi 12-14 March, 2013
  - Visit Agenda to Tsagveri and Borjomi 17-23 April, 2013
  - Visit Agenda to Tsagveri , Borjomi, Akhaldaba, 4- 5 December, 2013
  - List of trips in 2013
  - Trip report by Tamar Sanikidze, 7 May, 2012
  - Comments on Tamar Sanikidze's Trip report from May, 2012, 5 June, 2012
  - Trip report by Tamar Sanikidze, 7 November, 2012
- b) *Back to Office Reports 2014:*
- Back to Office Report, 16-17 January 2014
  - Back to Office Report, 8 May 2014
  - List of January trips, 2014
  - List of February visits, 2014
  - List of March visits, 2014
  - List of July visits, 2014
  - August visits, 2014
  - Tsagveri Visit Agenda, 6-8 August, 2014
  - Back to Office Report, 21-23 January, 2014
  - Back to Office Report, 22-22 February 2014
  - Back to Office Report, 20-22 March 2014

- Back to Office Report, 5-7 June 2014
- Back to Office Report, 18-20 June 2014
- Back to Office Report, 6-8 August 2014
- Back to Office Report, 15-17 August 2014
- Back to Office Report: 21-22 August 2014
- Back to Office Report, 10-11 December 2014
- c) Back to Office Reports 2015:
  - Back to Office Report, 21-23 January 2015
  - Back to Office Report, 11-13 February 2015
  - Back to Office Report 12-13 March 2015
  - Back to Office Report, 26-27 March
  - Back to Office Report, 28-30 April
  - Back to Office Report, 13-14 May
  - Back to Office Report, 4-5 June 2015
  - Back to Office Report, 14-16 July 2015
- 43. Budget revisions and AWP:
  - Budget revision and AWP June 2012
  - Budget revision and AWP December 2013
  - Budget revision and AWP December 2014
  - Budget revision and AWP June 2015
- 44. Knowledge Materials and Public Outreach 2012-2015
  - a) Basic info leaflets for farmers in Berry farming<sup>1</sup>:
    - Strawberry farming
    - Raspberry farming
  - b) Basic info leaflets for farmers in Veterinary<sup>2</sup>
    - Mastitis
    - Brucellosis
    - Tuberculosis
    - Pasture Management
    - Milk Cow Nutrition
    - Slake Instructions
    - Dispensarization
    - Milk Hygiene
    - Livestock and Temperature Outdoors
    - Lick blocks
  - c) Learning material for livestock farming<sup>3</sup>
    - Forage production

---

<sup>1</sup> Prepared by Lali Goginava, Doctor of Agriculture sciences

<sup>2</sup> Prepared by Tengiz Kurashvili, Professor and Doctor of Veterinary Science

<sup>3</sup> Prepared by Ioseb Sarjveladze, Professor and Doctor of Agriculture Sciences

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Hay production technology
- Pasture and hay-land
- Leguminous use for animal nutrition
- Pasture rational usage
- Pasture distribution
- d) Training material for organizational strengthening<sup>4</sup>
  - Participatory learning and action
- e) Tourism – information leaflets for six new marked trails<sup>5</sup>
  - Tsagveri Mineral Water - Uznariani fortress
  - Eifel bridge, Daba St. George church
  - Tori - Nadarbazevi
  - Mountain Tortiza
  - Mountain Gvirgvina
  - Bakuriani
- f) Elkana training materials for the Farmers Association “Green Valley”
  - Reporting
  - Accounting
  - International Technologies
  - Logic model
  - Organizational procedures
  - Organizational Development
  - Project cycle management
- g) Study materials for organic farming prepared by Elkana experts
  - Seed flow, seederation , mixed crops
  - Soil fertility, cultivation
  - Compost preparation
  - Bio-farming
  - Plant protection
  - Bio-farming outlines, certification scheme and internal control
- h) Training materials for the Tourism Centre<sup>6</sup>
  - Forms and documentation
  - Yard and house organization
  - Accounting and financial calculations
  - Communication
  - Promotion

---

<sup>4</sup> Prepared by Aleko Bagdadze, Sustainable Development Expert

<sup>5</sup> Prepared by Zviad Beglarishvili, Tourism Development expert

<sup>6</sup> Prepared by Manana Gigauri, Elkana expert

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Rules of conduct
  - Guesthouse management
  - Rural Tourism
  - Standard and Inspection procedures
  - Food and nutrition
  - Tourist associations
  - Tourist products
45. Informal environmental education at secondary schools
- Guidebook for Teachers (I – IX grades), prepared by a group of school teachers and experts
  - Waste Reduction and Recycling, prepared by Madona Pirvelashvili, Waste Management Expert
  - Organic Waste Management - Autumn Leaves, prepared by Nino Mumladze, Associated Professor, Chemical Sciences
  - Ten mini researches for the Youth Conferences in 2013 and 2014 on biodiversity, energy efficiency, waste management, forest restoration and water safety prepared by school children, eco clubs' members
46. Public awareness materials:
- a) Eco clubs' members on awareness raising TV shows on Imedi TV and GDS, four shows prepared by EcoVision
  - b) Informal environmental education introduced at eco clubs in Borjomi, Tsagveri and Akhaldaba public schools
  - c) Raising environmental consciousness - environmental education in the national curriculum
  - d) Eco clubs research clean water and energy efficiency for the second youth conference
  - e) Young rangers, forest care and maintenance, biodiversity
  - f) Eco clubs' members on awareness raising TV shows on Borjomi TV, five shows prepared by Borjomi TV:
    - Organic Waste Management – to burn or not to burn autumn leaves
    - Deforestation risks and forest restoration perspectives.
    - Safe drinking water, river pollution.
    - Energy efficiency – saving forests.
    - Environment education at schools – formal or informal? Activities of local eco-clubs
  - g) Media – responsible attitude to environment publicity:
    - Imedi TV, two Ecovision programmes with eco-clubs' members participation
    - Two public radio programmes Eco-Meter – Environmental Education and Rural development: biopharming and eco-tourism
    - TV programme “Our Farm” – organic farming and strawberry farms.
47. Teachers' Guidebook to Environmental Education
48. Young Forrester's' Guide
49. The Evaluation Policy of the UN, UNEP
50. The Evaluation Policy of UNDP
51. UNDP Strategic Plan 2008-2011, (extended to 2013), *UNDP*

52. UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017

53. World Bank Handbook on Impact Evaluation, Quantitative Methods and Practices, Khandker, Shahidur, Koolwal, Gayatri, Samad, Hussain, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2010

## Annex 5. Project Knowledge Products

1. AG International Consulting, 2015. LEPL NFA Capacity assessment.
2. Amendment to Cost-Sharing Agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (the donor) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 4 September 2012
3. Cheishvili K.A, Capacity Assessment of OXFAM GB.
4. Cheishvili K.A, Capacity Assessment of Biological Farming Association “Elkana”.
5. Cost-Sharing Agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (the donor) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 28 April, 2010
6. Drat Forest Code, 23 February, 2012
7. Ecovision, September, 2011. Initial Rural Needs Assessment Report for Consultancy Services for Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities.
8. Ecovision, September, 2011. Socio-Economic and Livelihood Assessment Report for Consultancy Services for Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities.
9. Ecovision, October, 2011. Public Awareness Report including recommendations for public outreach actions.
10. Ecovision, November, 2011. Rapid Rural Assessment and Local Livelihood Opportunities.
11. Environmental Education for Sustainability: National Strategy and Action Plan for 2012-2014.
12. Extension letters (Extension letter from UNDP, 29 August, 2014; Reply to extension letter, 10 September, 2014; Confirmation on extension, 16 September, 2014).
13. Georgian Technical University, 2010. Hydrogeological and geological engineering report
14. Georgian Technical University, 2010. Nursery hydrogeological report.
15. Gigauri G, February, 2011. Erosion Control Measures and Recommendations (*in Georgian*).
16. Gigauri G, December, 2010. Afforestation Plan (*in Georgian*).
17. Gigauri G, March, 2011. Nursery Plan (*in Georgian*).
18. Ludwig R, 2011. Mission Report 19 Sept, 2010: “International Consultant on project GIS forest inventory, ecosystem monitoring”.
19. Ludwig R, 2010. Mission Report 29 Nov, 2010: “International Consultant on project GIS forest inventory, ecosystem monitoring”.
20. Ludwig R, 2011. Draft Monitoring Guidelines: “International Consultant on project GIS forest inventory, ecosystem monitoring”.
21. Mikaberidze A, 2013. Forest restoration plan 2013.
22. Mikaberidze A, 2014. Forest restoration plan 2014.
23. Multitest, 2011. Nursery soil analysis report.
24. Namoradze T, March, 2011. Nursery Construction Plans (Engineering schemes , Cost-Estimations).
25. National Forestry Agency. Young Forester’s Manual (a text book for vocational education and eco-clubs).
26. OXFAM GB report DRR including: assessment of vulnerability and capacity of the target four villages, DRR profiles of the target villages with disaster risks defined and small mitigation projects formulated
27. Shamugia I, 2011. Capacity assessment for the LEPL Agency for Natural Resources and Basic Sapling Forestry
28. Suess W, 2010. Inception Report of the International Project Monitoring Technical Adviser Restoration.



## Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

29. Tavadze B and Supatashvili A, 2011. Pathological Survey/Study of the project area of about 400 ha and surrounding healthy forest in Borjomi District. *Report by Association of Protection of a Nature and Historical Values of Georgia “Phesvebi”*
30. The legislative amendments of the law about the “environmental protection”, March 2012
31. Zviadaze U, 2010. Report on geological assessment of the project area, engineering constructions and bio-engineering techniques (*in Georgian*).
32. Project Document “Restoration of Forest Ecosystems Damaged in Armed Conflict in Georgia”, 2010.
33. Project Document “Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment”, 2011.
34. CDRs (CDR-2010, CDR-2011, CDR-2012, CDR-2013, CDR-2014).
35. Project Executive Board Meeting Minutes.
  - PEB Minutes, 10 April, 2012
  - PEB Minutes, July 20, 2012
  - PEB Minutes, October 17, 2012
  - PEB Minutes, February 28, 2013
  - PEB Minutes, June 26, 2013
  - PEB Minutes, November 12, 2013
  - PEB Minutes, February 12, 2014
  - PEB Minutes, July 10, 2014
  - PEB Minutes, 28 May, 2015
36. Quarterly and Annual reports.
  - Project Progress report and Plan, 24 October, 2011
  - First Quarter Progress Report, April-June, 2012
  - Second Quarter Progress Report, July-September, 2012
  - Third quarter Progress Report, October – December 2012
  - Progress report for the period of January – May 2013, 4 June 2013
  - Progress report for the period of June - September 2013, 21 October 2013
  - Annual Progress report for April 2010 – June 2011, 21 July, 2011
  - Annual Progress report for 2013, February 2014
  - Progress Report for the period of January – June 2014, July 2014
  - Annual Progress Report for 2014, February 2015
  - Brief on Results of the UNDP project Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment 2012-2015, 28 May, 2015
  - Project chronology 2009-2011
  - Project Chronology 2012
37. Trip reports.
  - a) **Trip Reports 2012-2013**
    - 1- 2 May 2012-Trip report for Borjomi and Tsagveri, 4 May 2012
    - 9-12 May 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, 14 May, 2012
    - 20-22 June 2012-Trip report for Akhaltsikhe, Borjomi, Tsagveri, 25 June, 2012
    - 17-20 July, 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri 23 July, 2012
    - 8-10 August 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri, 13 August, 2012
    - 26-28 September 2012-Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri, September, 2012
    - 16-17 October, 2012 Trip report for Borjomi, Tsagveri, October, 2012
    - Agenda for Trip Borjomi Tsagveri Akhaldaba, 6-7 December 2012

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

- Visit Agenda to Tsagveri and Borjomi 7-9 August 2013
- Visit Agenda to Tsagveri and Borjomi 12-14 March, 2013
- Visit Agenda to Tsagveri and Borjomi 17-23 April, 2013
- Visit Agenda to Tsagveri , Borjomi, Akhaldaba, 4- 5 December, 2013
- List of trips in 2013
- Trip report by Tamar Sanikidze, 7 May, 2012
- Comments on Tamar Sanikidze's Trip report from May, 2012, 5 June, 2012
- Trip report by Tamar Sanikidze, 7 November, 2012

**b) Back to Office Reports 2014:**

- Back to Office Report, 16-17 January 2014
- Back to Office Report, 8 May 2014
- List of January trips, 2014
- List of February visits, 2014
- List of March visits, 2014
- List of July visits, 2014
- August visits, 2014
- Tsagveri Visit Agenda, 6-8 August, 2014
- Back to Office Report, 21-23 January, 2014
- Back to Office Report, 22-22 February 2014
- Back to Office Report, 20-22 March 2014
- Back to Office Report, 5-7 June 2014
- Back to Office Report, 18-20 June 2014
- Back to Office Report, 6-8 August 2014
- Back to Office Report, 15-17 August 2014
- Back to Office Report: 21-22 August 2014
- Back to Office Report, 10-11 December 2014

**c) Back to Office Reports 2015:**

- Back to Office Report, 21-23 January 2015
  - Back to Office Report, 11-13 February 2015
  - Back to Office Report 12-13 March 2015
  - Back to Office Report, 26-27 March
  - Back to Office Report, 28-30 April
  - Back to Office Report, 13-14 May
  - Back to Office Report, 4-5 June 2015
  - Back to Office Report, 14-16 July 2015
38. Budget revision and AWP.
- Budget revision and AWP June 2012
  - Budget revision and AWP December 2013
  - Budget revision and AWP December 2014
  - Budget revision and AWP June 2015

39. Knowledge Materials and Public Outreach 2012-2015

- a) **Basic info leaflets for farmers in Berry farming**<sup>1</sup>:
  - Strawberry farming
  - Raspberry farming
- b) **Basic info leaflets for farmers in Veterinary** <sup>2</sup>
  - Mastitis
  - Brucellosis
  - Tuberculosis
  - Pasture Management
  - Milk Cow Nutrition
  - Slake Instructions
  - Dispensarization
  - Milk Hygiene
  - Livestock and Temperature Outdoors
  - Lick blocks
- c) **Learning material for livestock farming** <sup>3</sup>
  - Forage production
  - Hay production technology
  - Pasture and hay-land
  - Leguminous use for animal nutrition
  - Pasture rational usage
  - Pasture distribution
- d) **Training material for organizational strengthening**<sup>4</sup>
  - Participatory learning and action
- e) **Tourism – information leaflets for six new marked trails**<sup>5</sup>
  - Tsagveri Mineral Water - Uznariani fortress
  - Eifel bridge, Daba St. George church
  - Tori - Nadarbazevi
  - Mountain Tortiza
  - Mountain Gvirgvina
  - Bakuriani
- f) **Elkana training materials for the Farmers Association “Green Valley”**
  - Reporting
  - Accounting
  - International Technologies
  - Logic model
  - Organizational procedures
  - Organizational Development

---

<sup>1</sup> Prepared by Lali Goginava, Doctor of Agriculture sciences

<sup>2</sup> Prepared by Tengiz Kurashvili, Professor and Doctor of Veterinary Science

<sup>3</sup> Prepared by Ioseb Sarjveladze, Professor and Doctor of Agriculture Sciences

<sup>4</sup> Prepared by Aleko Bagdadze, Sustainable Development Expert

<sup>5</sup> Prepared by Zviad Beglarishvili, Tourism Development expert

- Project cycle management
- g) **Study materials for organic farming prepared by Elkana experts**
  - Seed flow, seederation , mixed crops
  - Soil fertility, cultivation
  - Compost preparation
  - Bio-farming
  - Plant protection
  - Bio-farming outlines, certification scheme and internal control
- h) **Training materials for the Tourism Centre**<sup>6</sup>
  - Forms and documentation
  - Yard and house organization
  - Accounting and financial calculations
  - Communication
  - Promotion
  - Rules of conduct
  - Guesthouse management
  - Rural Tourism
  - Standard and Inspection procedures
  - Food and nutrition
  - Tourist associations
  - Tourist products
- 40. Informal environmental education at secondary schools
  - Guidebook for Teachers (I – IX grades), prepared by a group of school teachers and experts
  - Waste Reduction and Recycling, prepared by Madona Pirvelashvili, Waste Management Expert
  - Organic Waste Management - Autumn Leaves, prepared by Nino Mumladze, Associated Professor, Chemical Sciences
  - Ten mini researches for the Youth Conferences in 2013 and 2014 on biodiversity, energy efficiency, waste management, forest restoration and water safety prepared by school children, eco clubs' members
- 41. Public awareness materials:
  - a) Eco clubs' members on awareness raising TV shows on Imedi TV and GDS, four shows prepared by EcoVision
  - b) Informal environmental education introduced at eco clubs in Borjomi, Tsagveri and Akhaldaba public schools
  - c) Raising environmental consciousness - environmental education in the national curriculum
  - d) Eco clubs research clean water and energy efficiency for the second youth conference
  - e) Young rangers, forest care and maintenance, biodiversity
  - f) Eco clubs' members on awareness raising TV shows on Borjomi TV, five shows prepared by Borjomi TV:
    - Organic Waste Management – to burn or not to burn autumn leaves
    - Deforestation risks and forest restoration perspectives.
    - Safe drinking water, river pollution.

---

<sup>6</sup> Prepared by Manana Gigauri, Elkana expert

\_\_\_ Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to \_\_\_  
Environment

- Energy efficiency – saving forests.
- Environment education at schools – formal or informal? Activities of local eco-clubs
- g) Media – responsible attitude to environment publicity:
  - Imedi TV, two Ecovision programmes with eco-clubs’ members participation
  - Two public radio programmes Eco-Meter – Environmental Education and Rural development: biopharming and eco-tourism
  - TV programme “Our Farm” – organic farming and strawberry farms.

## **Annex 6. Brief Biographies of the Evaluators**

### ***Nana Gibradze***

Ms. Nana Gibradze has 20 years' experience in formulation, management and evaluation of development policies and programmes, mostly with UNDP. She has worked in the areas of Capacity Development, Crisis Prevention and Recovery, Poverty/Social Development and Governance. Her expertise includes leading and conducting evaluations, institutional assessments as well as organizational and capacity development. She has worked for RBEC, RBLAC and is on various UNDP rosters including BCPR ExpRes, RBLAC CPR Roster and RBEC Monitoring and Evaluation Roster.

Ms. Gibradze holds a Master of Arts equivalent from Tbilisi State University in Languages and Social Sciences and Master's Degree in Public Administration from Harvard University specializing in International Development. In addition to her native Georgian, Ms. Gibradze is fluent in English, Spanish and Russian has a working knowledge of French. Born Georgia, she has been living and working in the LAC region since 2004.

### ***Ketevan Skhireli***

Ms. Ketevan (Keti) Skhireli is an environmental specialist with more than 10 years working experience in natural resources management, sustainable development, protected areas, biodiversity, EIAs and waste management. Throughout her career, she has been engaged with different institutions, such as academia, government, NGOs, regional and international organizations. Ms. Skhireli has been involved in the WB's protected areas and forest development projects in Georgia. She led experts team from Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia in the regional project of Tematea (issue-based module on international agreements related to biodiversity) and ENPI FLEG (Improving Forest Low and Governance). Ms. Skhireli has participated in mid-term and/or terminal evaluations of UNDP projects related to protected areas management, flood risks management, waste management issues, and the like.

Ms. Skhireli is a graduate (BSc) of Tbilisi State University with major in biology and ecology. She also holds Master's degree in Biology and Ecology from Tbilisi State University and Masters degree in Environmental Sciences and Policy from the Central European University (Budapest). Ms. Skhireli is fluent in Georgian, English and Russian.

## Annex 7. Evaluation Agenda

Thursday, October 1, 2015, Tbilisi

Time	Organisation/Event	Person/Position	Contact	Address
10:00 - 13:00	Briefing with UNDP Country Office Management	Ms. Nino Antadze - Energy and Environment Team Leader	(995) 599 093989 <a href="mailto:nino.antadze@undp.org">nino.antadze@undp.org</a>	15 a Paliashvili str.
		Ms. Nestan Khuntsaria – Programme Associate	(995) 599 700255 <a href="mailto:nestan.khuntsaria@undp.org">nestan.khuntsaria@undp.org</a>	
		Ms. Lali Meskhi – Project Manager	(995) 599 539003 <a href="mailto:asmat.lali.meskhi@undp.org">asmat.lali.meskhi@undp.org</a>	
14:00-15:00	Meeting with PMU	Ms. Lali Meskhi – Project Manager	(995) 599 539003 <a href="mailto:asmat.lali.meskhi@undp.org">asmat.lali.meskhi@undp.org</a>	15 a Paliashvili str.
		Ms. Ketevan Ann Cheishvili – Project Assistant	(995) 599 101909 <a href="mailto:Ketevan.Cheishvili@undp.org">Ketevan.Cheishvili@undp.org</a>	
15:40-16:50	Meeting with Forest Agency	Ms. Natia Iordanishvili- Head of Forest Restoration Unit	(995) 595 300991 <a href="mailto:n.iordanishvili@anr.ge">n.iordanishvili@anr.ge</a> ; <a href="mailto:n.iordanishvili@yahoo.com">n.iordanishvili@yahoo.com</a>	6 Gulua str.
		Mr. Karlo Amirgulashvili – Head of the forest Policy Unit	(995) 591 819613 <a href="mailto:k.amirgulashvili@moe.gov.ge">k.amirgulashvili@moe.gov.ge</a>	6 Gulua str..
16:50-17:40	Meeting at the MENRP	Dr. Merab Machavariani- Project Manager in 2010-2011	(995) 599 571588 <a href="mailto:biodiv@caucasus.net">biodiv@caucasus.net</a>	6 Gulua str..
17:50-18:10	Meeting at the MENRP with former Borjomi Gangebeli	Dimitry Beridze -- Gangebeli of Borjomi in 2014	(995) 599 700222 <a href="mailto:ditoberidze@gmail.com">ditoberidze@gmail.com</a>	6 Gulua str.
19:00-20:00	Meeting with former representatives of Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Georgia	Ms. Khatuna Gogaladze-Minister in 2012-2014	(995) 599 800307 <a href="mailto:Kh_gogaladze@yahoo.com">Kh_gogaladze@yahoo.com</a>	13 Tamarashvili str.
		Ms. Nino Sharashidze- Deputy Minister 2012-2014	(995) 599 959598	
		Ms. Inga Nikagosian – PR, MENRP in 2012-2014	(995) 577 293979 <a href="mailto:inganikagosian@gmail.com">inganikagosian@gmail.com</a>	

**Friday, October 2, 2015, Tbilisi**

Time	Organisation/Event	Person/Position	Contact	Address
09:30-10:00	Meeting at APA	Mr. Avtandil Mikaberidze – Forest Specialist	(955) 577 101898 <a href="mailto:a.mikaberidze1@gmail.com">a.mikaberidze1@gmail.com</a>	6 Gulua str.
11:00 -11:30	Meeting at the Ministry of Energy	Ms. Marika Valishvili, Deputy Minister	(995) 577 960505	Sanapiro, 2 Zviad Gamsakhurdia Named Right Bank
12:00 -13:00	Meeting with Nursery	Mr. Revaz Bejashvili – Director of Sartichala Nursery	(995) 592 339399 <a href="mailto:rezobeja@gmail.com">rezobeja@gmail.com</a>	6 Gulua str.
14:00-15:00	Meeting with UNDP	Ms. Sopho Tchichinadze – Head of PR Department	<a href="mailto:sophie.tchichinadze@undp.org">sophie.tchichinadze@undp.org</a>	9 Eristavi str..
15:30-16:15	Ministry of Education	Ms. Rusudan Tevzadze – National Curriculum and General Education Development Department	(995) 577 435272 <a href="mailto:ruskatevzadze@yahoo.com">ruskatevzadze@yahoo.com</a>	52 Uznadze str.
16:30-17:30	Meeting with OXFAM	Mr. Giorgi Datusani – Humanitarian Programme Officer	(995) 599 513262 <a href="mailto:gatusani@oxfam.org.uk">gatusani@oxfam.org.uk</a>	20 Kipshidze str.
18:00-18:45	Group Meeting with Elkana	Mr. Tamaz Dundua - Project manager, Elkana - support and training of local farmers, repair of guesthouses	(995) 595 95 33 77 <a href="mailto:manager@elkana.org.ge">manager@elkana.org.ge</a>	16 Gazapkhuli str.
		Ms. Nana Kartvelishvili - Project Coordinator, Elkana	(995) 597 275075 <a href="mailto:ruraltourism@elkana.org.ge">ruraltourism@elkana.org.ge</a>	
		Ms. Manana Gigauri – Organizational Development	(995) 2 536486 <a href="mailto:publications@elkana.org.ge">publications@elkana.org.ge</a>	

**Saturday, October 3, 2015**

**Break**



**Sunday, October 4, 2015 Meetings in Borjomi**

Time	Organisation/Event	Person/Position	Contact	Address
8:30	<b>Departure from Tbilisi to Tsagveri</b>			
11:00-14:00	<b>Visiting Demo Sites</b>			
	Visiting Demo Project in Daba	Ms. Irma Magradze – Farmer in Daba/Head of Daba cooperative	Demo projects in Daba, Tsagveri, Timotesubani and Mzetamze	
	Visiting Demo project in Timotesubani	Ms. Khatuna Inasaridze – Farmer in Timotesubani		
	Visiting Demo projects in Tsagveri	Demo projects of Mr. Otar Arbolishvili		
	Visiting Guest-houses in Tsagveri	Mr. Lasha Paksashvili – Guest house owner Ms. Eka Tabatadze - Guest house owner Mr. Jambul Gelashvili –Owner of the Guset House- “ Tsagveri Lodge” Ms. Marina Tsitsadze - Owner of the Guset House- “ Tsagveri Lodge”		
	Visiting Demo Project in Mzetamze	Ms. Dali Qasashvili – Farmer/Demo project of Solar water heaters and eco toilets		
14:00	Meeting with Rural Farmers Association “Mtsvane Veli”	Ms. Maka Gongadze – Head of association/Director since June 2015		
		Mr. Alexander Zarnadze – Manager of Rural Farmers Association	(995) 593 473 699 <a href="mailto:leqso.zarnadze@gmail.com">leqso.zarnadze@gmail.com</a>	
16:00	Visiting Tsagveri Library and Tsagveri Park	Ms. Maka Gongadze – Head of association/Director since June 2015	(995) 598 267 247 <a href="mailto:makagongadze1983@gmail.com">makagongadze1983@gmail.com</a>	
		Mr. Alexander Zarnadze – Manager of Rural Farmers Association	(995) 593 473 699 <a href="mailto:leqso.zarnadze@gmail.com">leqso.zarnadze@gmail.com</a>	

**Monday, October 5, 2015 Meetings in Borjomi**

Time	Organisation/Event	Person/Position/Venue	Contact	Address
9:00-10:00	Visiting restored forest area and school nursery	Mr. Merab Tediashvili – Forest guard from Daba Mr. Mikheil Tediashvili – villager participated in forest restorations	-	Village Daba
11:00-11:30	Meeting at Borjomi Gamgeoba	Mr. Anzor Svanidze - First Deputy Gamgebeli	(995)596095000 <a href="mailto:anzorsvanidze1985@gmail.com">anzorsvanidze1985@gmail.com</a>	Borjomi Gamgeoba
12:00-13:00	Group Meeting with Journalists	Ms. Marina Kupatadze – TV Borjomi	(995) 593 622 225 <a href="mailto:marinatvb@gmail.com">marinatvb@gmail.com</a>	5 Pirosmeni str, Borjomi
		Ms. Nino Vartapetiani – Journalist, TV Borjomi	(995) 593 693 162 <a href="mailto:ninoTVB@gmail.com">ninoTVB@gmail.com</a>	
14:00-15:00	Group Meeting with Ecoclubs	<b>Borjomi School #1</b>		Resource Centre, 1 Rustaveli str, Borjomi
		Ms. Julieta Jinjolava – Director of Borjomi School 1		
		Ms Mariam Dadiani –eco-club member		
		Ms. Nia Datunishvili –eco-club member		
		<b>Borjomi School #3,</b>		
		Ms. Khatuna Kharazashvili – Director of Borjomi School 3		
		Ms. Lika Gogoladze – eco-club member		
		Mr. Alexi Velashvili – eco-club member		
		<b>Borjomi School #4</b>		
		Ms. Ledi Solomonidze – Deputy Director Borjomi School 4		
		Ms. Marine Peradze – eco-club teacher		
		Ms. Ana Gvirjishvili – eco-club member		
		Ms. Natia Tugushi – eco-club member		

**Tuesday, October 6, 2015, Meetings in Tbilisi**

Time	Organisation/Event	Person/Position/Venue	Contact	Address
14:00-15:00	Meeting with UNDP	Mr. Shombi Sharp – Deputy Resident Representative	(995) 577 330 033 <a href="mailto:shombi.sharp@undp.org">shombi.sharp@undp.org</a>	9 Eristavi str.
		Ms. Natia Natsvlishvili - Assistant Resident Representative	<a href="mailto:natia.natsvlishvili@undp.org">natia.natsvlishvili@undp.org</a>	
15:00-16:00	Group Meeting with Experts	Ms. Lali Goginava – Expert, Berry and Fruit	(995) 595 555 560 <a href="mailto:lgoginava@mail.ru">lgoginava@mail.ru</a>	15 Paliashvili str..
		Mr. Irakli Rekhviashvili – Forage Production	(995) 599 729 875 (995) 555 251 965 <a href="mailto:ir.rekh@gmail.com">ir.rekh@gmail.com</a>	
		Ms. Nino Gamisonia – Eco-sanitation	(995) 599 548 292 (995) 593 001 778 <a href="mailto:n.gamisonia@gmail.com">n.gamisonia@gmail.com</a>	
		Ms. Liana Garibashvili – Energy Efficiency Expert	(995) 599 548 782 <a href="mailto:l_gari@ecgeo.org">l_gari@ecgeo.org</a>	
16:00-16:45	Meeting with Project Expert	Mr Zviad Beglarishvili – Expert in Tourism (making of hiking trails)	(995) 595 309 100 <a href="mailto:z.beglarishvili@geoland.ge">z.beglarishvili@geoland.ge</a>	15 Paliashvili str..
17:00-18:00	Meeting with former UNDP Energy and Environment Team Leader	Ms. Mariam Shotadze - Energy and Environment Team Leader in 2010	(995) 593 328446	5a Delisi I Chikhi.

**Wednesday, October 7, 2015 Tbilisi**

Time	Organisation/Event	Person/Position/Venue	Contact	Address
10:00-12:00	Focus group with NGOs	Nato Sultanishvili - Head of Environmental Education Department, LEPL	(995) 595 999908 <a href="mailto:natosultanishvili@gmail.com">natosultanishvili@gmail.com</a>	Conference room at MENRP, 6 Gulua str.
		Ms. Irina Japaridze– EcoVision, Executive Director	(995) 574 738871 <a href="mailto:info@ecovision.ge">info@ecovision.ge</a> <a href="mailto:Georgia@spareworld.org">Georgia@spareworld.org</a> <a href="mailto:nino.sulkhanishvili@tsu.ge">nino.sulkhanishvili@tsu.ge</a>	
		Mr. Giorgi Magradze – Greens Movement of Georgia, Program Manager	(995) 599 244632 <a href="mailto:magio7@gmail.com">magio7@gmail.com</a>	
		Mr. Giorgi Lebanidze – Sustainable Management of Biodiversity, South Caucasus (GIZ)	(995) 599 271807 <a href="mailto:Giorgi.lebanidze@giz.de">Giorgi.lebanidze@giz.de</a>	

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

		Ms. Ana Inasaridze – Environmental Projects Coordinator, CENN	(995) 593 924844 <a href="mailto:nino.gaprindashvili@cenn.org">nino.gaprindashvili@cenn.org</a>	
		Ms. Manana Ratiani – Teachers’ House	(955) 577 555216 <a href="mailto:ratianimanana@hotmail.com">ratianimanana@hotmail.com</a>	
		Ms. Eto Jincharadze-Eco-Clubs Coordinator	(995) 574 738771 <a href="mailto:eto.jincharadze@yahoo.de">eto.jincharadze@yahoo.de</a>	
12:00-13:00	Group Meeting with Forestry Agency	Ms. Marina Sujashvili – Deputy Head of Forest Restoration Unit	(955) 595 300992	6 Gulua str.
		Mr. Soso Pitskhelauri – Forest Restoration Project Coordinator	(955) 599280809 <a href="mailto:pitskhelauris@yahoo.de">pitskhelauris@yahoo.de</a>	
13:30-14:00	Meeting with former deputy minister of environment	Mr. Giorgi Zedgenidze – Former Deputy Minister, MENRP	(995) 599 171191	5 Kostava str.

**Thursday, October 8, 2015 Tbilisi**

11:00 - 12:00	Debriefing with UNDP Country Office Management	Ms. Nino Antadze - Energy and Environment Team Leader	(995) 599 093989 <a href="mailto:nino.antadze@undp.org">nino.antadze@undp.org</a>	9 Eristavi str.
		Mr. Shombi Sharp – Deputy Resident Representative	(995) 577 330 033 <a href="mailto:shombi.sharp@undp.org">shombi.sharp@undp.org</a>	
		Ms. Natia Natsvlishvili - Assistant Resident Representative	<a href="mailto:natia.natsvlishvili@undp.org">natia.natsvlishvili@undp.org</a>	
18:15	Skype Interview	Ms. Sophia Kemkhadze	<a href="mailto:Sophie.kemkhadze@undp.org">Sophie.kemkhadze@undp.org</a>	Tbilisi

**Friday, October 9, 2015 Tbilisi**

9:00	Skype Interview	Mr. Petri Salo, Former Finnish Ambassador	<a href="mailto:Petri.Salo@formin.fi">Petri.Salo@formin.fi</a>	Tbilisi
16:30	Skype Interview	Ms. Bela Avalishvili, OPIZARI	(995) 599 172 005 <a href="mailto:belaavalishvili@gmail.com">belaavalishvili@gmail.com</a>	Tbilisi
9:00	Skype Interview	Ms. Nana Zubashvili, Field Coordinator	(995) 595451911 <a href="mailto:nana.zubashvili@gmail.com">nana.zubashvili@gmail.com</a> Skype – naiada67	Tbilisi

Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Promote Sustainable Livelihoods and Responsible Attitude to Environment

**Tuesday, 13 October 2015**

11:00	Skype Interview	Ms. Keti Metreveli, ADA Project Coordinator	(995) 599117895	Tbilisi
-------	-----------------	---	-----------------	---------

**Wednesday, 14 October 2015**

10:00	Meeting	Mr. Christer Michelsson - Current Finnish Ambassador	<a href="mailto:Christer.Michelsson@formin.fi">Christer.Michelsson@formin.fi</a>	Tbilisi
-------	---------	--	--	---------