

## **Zagros Mountains Landscape Conservation Project**

Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone

### **Mid-Term Evaluation**

March 2011

#### **ANNEXES**

ANNEX I	Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation
ANNEX II.a	MTE Itinerary Achieved
ANNEX II.b	MTE Respondents
ANNEX III	MTE Documents reviewed
ANNEX IV	Project Logical Framework, Project Brief (2005) Annex 2.1
ANNEX V.a	Original Project Budget Plan
ANNEX V.b	Project Expenditure Record

## ANNEX I

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

**Project title:** Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone  
**Duty Station:** Zagros Project Office, Department of Environment Tehran, Iran with site visits in provinces  
**Evaluation Team:** 1 international consultant (acting as team leader) and 1 national consultant  
**Type of Contract:** SSA contract  
**Duration:** 4 months starting November 2010

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Standard UNDP GEF M&E Requirements

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments

### 1.2 Project Context

#### Geographical Context

The Islamic Republic of Iran covers 1.648 million km<sup>2</sup> and lies between 25° and 40° N. It is situated at the confluence of three climatic zones – the Mediterranean, the arid West Asian and the humid/semi-humid Caspian zone. It is highly mountainous, with an average altitude of 1200m a.s.l, and many peaks over 4,000m. The complex and varied climates, topography, geological formations and anthropological management of natural resources for many millennia have led to a varied and unique biological diversity.

The Iranian ecosystems support over 8,000 recorded species of plants (over 2,500 endemic), over 500 species of birds, 160 mammals and 164 reptiles (24 endemic). This includes a large number of wild relatives of commercial species – both plants and animals, confirming Iran's status as a centre of genetic biodiversity. Also, a large number of Iran's plant and tree species have traditional uses as medicines, aromas and pigments. Iran has a varied but generally harsh climate – typically arid with large temperature fluctuations, but also large rainfall fluctuations. Many species and varieties have successfully adapted to surviving in these harsh conditions.

The Zagros region lies to the West of Iran, stretching from close to the north-western border with Turkey, parallel to the border with Iraq down to the Persian gulf and stretching inwards towards the central deserts of Iran. The region is approximately 1,500km long, 400km wide at its widest, and covers approximately 400,000 km<sup>2</sup> or one quarter of Iran. The Zagros Mountains, covering 70% of the Zagros region, stretch from North-West to South-East, and generally divide the Mediterranean climatic zone (to the west of the mountains) from the arid-West Asian zone. The Zagros ecosystem falls into the Palaeartic realm

#### Institutional Context

The ultimate decision-making and coordination mechanism for environmental affairs is the Environmental High Council (EHC), chaired by the President of the Republic. This multi-sectoral, governmental body meets regularly to approve environmental policies and legislation, and to ensure that environmental policies are integrated into social and economic policies and plans. One level lower, the National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD) is responsible for policy development and implementation – including the mainstreaming of environmental issues into the work programmes of all government agencies. The NCSD has 18 members, including academic and NGO representatives. The NCSD works primarily through its 11 Sub-Committees, of which one of the most active has been the Biodiversity Sub-Committee.

The Department of Environment (DoE) has overall responsibility for nature and biodiversity conservation, for implementing the NBSAP and for meeting Iran's commitments to the CBD. DoE is headed by a Vice-President of the Republic, who reports directly to the President, placing it higher than most line ministries in the government administration. This high standing reflects the fact that, in order to achieve its goals, DoE must coordinate with other agencies, and must be able to mainstream environmental objectives into sectoral development. DoE provides the Secretariat for the EHC and the NCS. DoE has affiliates in each of the country's 31 provinces. The main responsibility of the provincial affiliates is to implement the national programmes in the concerned province.

The Protected Area Network (PAN) is, at present, the main tool for conserving biodiversity and nature in Iran. DoE is responsible for managing and implementing most of the PAN. The first protected areas were established in the 1960's in order to protect game for hunting. There are now four categories of protected land: (in order of decreasing protection) National Parks, Wildlife Refuges, Protected Areas and no-Hunting Zones. This system is managed through the DoE provincial offices, and in many rural provinces this is the main activity and objective of the DoE office.

The Ministry of Agricultural Jihad (MoAJ) plays a key role in natural resource management and rural development. MoAJ is responsible for forest, rangelands and agricultural lands. It is also responsible for watershed management and for nomadic affairs. MoAJ responsibilities include implementing well-funded physical infrastructure projects, controlling land-use on state-owned land – especially forest land, and projects providing technical support to communities. It implements projects aiming to improve agricultural and rural development.

Other key agencies involved in natural resource management are:

- The Water Organization within the Ministry of Energy is responsible for water management, including construction of water management infrastructure, distribution of water to users. In some cases, the Water Organization also has responsibilities related to catchment protection; and
- The Cultural Heritage and Tourism Organization (CHTO), with responsibilities related to protecting cultural and natural heritage, and to promoting eco-tourism.

In line with the ongoing decentralization process, provincial governments play an increasing important financial, political and technical role in supporting sustainable development in Iran. The scale of this role, both overall and in specific sectors, varies from province to province in line with provincial capacity. The leading decision-maker at provincial level is the Governor-General, who is the direct representative of the President. One Deputy-Governor General is responsible for sustainable development including natural resource management. Key responsibilities of the Governor General's office include:

- Allocation of budget at provincial level;
- Ensuring that programmes funded by the national government are implemented appropriately;
- Participating in the recruitment and management of human resources that are funded by the national programmes.

In each province, Governor-Generals have established Provincial Planning Councils (PPC) to ensure the coordination of all nationally funded policies and programmes. All main government departments, including DoE, are represented on the PPC. In order to facilitate natural resources management and coordination across related sectors, each PPC has established a Water, Agriculture and Natural Resources Working Group, in which the provincial FRWO and DoE take a leading role.

### 1.3 Project Objectives

The proposed Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone (the *Conservation Zone*) lies in the middle part of the central Zagros Mountains. The proposed Conservation Zone straddles four provinces. It covers almost all of Chaharmahal & Bakhtiari province, large parts of Kohkiluyeh & Boyer-Ahmad province, and most of Eghlid and Marvdasht districts in Fars province and Semirum district in Isfahan Province. The total area is approximately 25,000 km<sup>2</sup> and the vast majority of land is comprised of forests, rangelands or cropland. Approximately 87% of the land is under the direct management of government agencies, including the forests, rangelands, mountains, rivers and mines.

This project aims to conserve the biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone. Over an area of 2,500,000 hectares, the project will work with the agriculture, forestry, rangelands, water and tourism sectors in order to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into the sectors. It will also strengthen the ability of the protected area system to complement this mainstreaming. The project will also demonstrate biodiversity mainstreaming at the local level in a series of villages across the Zone, and establish mechanisms to facilitate the dissemination and replication of the successful village approaches. The project adopts a business-oriented approach to biodiversity conservation, and is designed to support ongoing efforts to improve livelihoods and stimulate economic development across the Zone. Finally, the project will develop the necessary capacity, at individual, institutional and systemic level, in national agencies to support the innovative approaches to biodiversity conservation being developed in the Zone.

The project aims to achieve the following 3 outcomes:

- A national institutional and policy framework that is fully supportive of mainstreaming biodiversity into development in central Zagros mountains;
- Sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity is integrated into economic and sectoral programmes and government practices at the Conservation Zone level; and

- Successful, sustainable financially replicable models of village designed and driven approaches to increasing income generation and conserving biodiversity in biodiversity rich areas.

#### 1.4 Implementation Modality of the Project

The Zagros Project was signed in June 2005, and started its implementation in 2006. The project was recently extended until December 2012. The project is being implemented by the Department of Environment through the UNDP National Implementation (NIM) modality. The NIM modality places the National Implementing Partner of the project in a central position of implementing the project towards and achieving its intended results. UNDP provides backstopping and oversight services to project activities and acts as the custodian of the GEF resources to ensure that the project budget is effectively used for the implementation of agreed work plans and within the framework of the Project Document.

### 2.0 Objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is being initiated pursuant to the Project Document and donor reporting requirements, and at the request of the Department of Environment and UNDP. The MTE is a monitoring and evaluation process which occurs at the project level in the middle of project implementation.

The Mid-term Evaluation aims to review the relevance, performance and success of the Zagros Project. It looks at potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the progress towards the achievement of global and national environmental goals and rural livelihood improvement. It will also identify and document lessons thus far learned and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of project work plans and monitoring mechanisms.

Consistent with donor evaluation policies (specifically UNDP/GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy), the objectives of the MTE are:

- To monitor and evaluate progress towards achieving results and impacts, including an assessment of sustainability;
- To provide a basis for decision making on actions to be taken for the remaining years of the project;
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of resource use; and
- To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons so far learned.

The main stakeholders of this evaluation are:

- The Zagros Project;
- The Department of Environment;
- UNDP;
- The Ministry of Jihad Agriculture;
- The Forest, Rangelands and Watershed Management Organization under the above ministry;
- The Ministry of Energy;
- The Cultural Heritage and Tourism Organization;
- The ministry of Interior;
- The Non-Governmental Organization; and
- The local communities.

The MTE is intended to be a systematic learning exercise for project partners. The exercise is therefore structured so as to generate and share experiences and practical knowledge. To achieve this, the evaluation will take place in a consultative rather than an advisory manner. It is important to emphasize that the process is not about finding fault or a proxy for measuring individual or institutional performance.

### 3.0 Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The main area of focus for the MTE of the Zagros Project will be on reviewing the activities carried out under the GEF-funded component of the project. The process of the evaluation will be consultative and participatory. On the basis of their review, the MTE team will draw lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of project work plans, monitoring and reporting mechanisms and practices, engagement of stakeholders and partnership mechanisms, timeliness of project outputs and effectiveness of the progress to achieve the intended results. The review will address the key issues listed below.

#### 3.1 Project Design

The MTE will assess the extent to which the overall project design remains valid. The evaluation team will review the project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development of the government. The team will:

- assess the extent to which the underlying assumptions remain valid;
- assess the approach used in design and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area;

- assess the plans for replicating or scaling up the experiences of the Zagros project from the selected 8 pilot villages to the entire Zagros area;
- assess the extent to which the project addressed any design recommendations made by Steering Committee of the project.

The evaluation team will also attempt to ascertain the current level of comprehension of the project concept, focusing on four specific sets of actors: (i) project management; (ii) project staff; and (iii) central Department of Environment; and (iv) field operation.

### 3.2 Project Implementation Assessment

The MTE will assess the extent to which project management and implementation have been effective, efficient and responsive. Specifically, it will:

- assess overall institutional arrangements for the execution, implementation, management, monitoring and review of the project. This covers a number of issues, including: the appropriateness of joint implementation and coordination; whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities; the effectiveness of government counterparts and project coordinators; and the effectiveness of relationships between key stakeholders;
- assess the use of logical framework as a management tool during implementation;
- assess indicators of adaptive management;
- assess the quality, objectivity, frequency and relevance of project reporting;
- assess the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management;
- describe and assess efforts of UNDP and the executing agency to support the GEF component; and
- analyze the project financing model, specifically how the project has materialized/leveraged co-financing for various components (this is preferably presented in a matrix form).

### 3.3 Results

The MTE will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and results achieved within the GEF component of the project, by showing how the component processes and outcomes have contributed to the achievement of project and GEF environmental goals. The MTE will:

- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, the achievements and impact of the project in terms of outputs and its contribution to outcomes as defined in the project document;
- assess to what extent the project has made impacts on improving biodiversity conservation and rural livelihoods, looking at the degree to which it has promoted participatory decision-making on land use, user rights and integrated rural livelihood improvement;
- assess the extent to which the project has leveraged other partners to promote integrated rural livelihood development and conservation; and
- assess the sustainability of project results.

The evaluation team will develop and use a monitoring framework – including time-bound, quantifiable and benchmarked indicators – to determine the overall contribution of project outcomes to development and global environmental goals. The framework will preferably be in matrix form and based on the project logical framework as well as higher level development and environmental goals. These may include, for example, targets/indicators set out in the Five-year Development Plans, National Biodiversity Strategy, United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2005-2009, GEF biodiversity objectives, etc. The assessment will be conducted in light of the defined objectives, the methodology adopted and the available budget of the project. In addition to identifying areas where the project has fallen short of its goals, the evaluation team is also asked to distil the key achievements of the project as concisely as possible. The focus here is on identifying the project's positive contributions to issues such as protected areas governance, conservation and rural livelihoods, particularly those changes which would not have occurred but for the project activities. The evaluation team is also invited to highlight contributions which are strictly beyond the project scope.

### 3.4 Governance and capacity-building

The MTE will look at how the project contributed to improved governance at local and national levels, and examine how governance issues have impacted on the achievement of project goals and outputs.

One of the specific areas the evaluation team is asked to assess in this area is how and to what extent the project has built management, planning and operational capacity among the project's government partners, at the national and provincial levels. This should include an overview of capacity-building techniques employed by the project – e.g. training, learning by doing, mentoring, coaching - and an assessment of:

- how national and provincial staff have contributed to the achievement of project objectives;
- how the skills, knowledge and attitudes of government project staff have improved against baseline levels as a result of the project's capacity-building activities; and
- how the project has addressed gender issues.

### 3.5 Recommendations and lessons learned

Drawing lessons from the analysis in 3.1 to 3.4 above, the evaluation team will make any recommendations it has on any necessary adjustments to the project design, to project activities, procedures and implementation for the ongoing project. The MTE will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. Finally, the evaluation will recommend activities, including an outline of possible donor-funded interventions, to consolidate and build on project achievements going forward.

### 4.0 Products expected from the Evaluation

The Evaluation will produce the following outputs:

- record of key outputs from evaluation process, including workshop outputs, and minutes of meetings with stakeholders; and
- a detailed Evaluation report based on the UNDP/GEF formats.

The principal evaluation product will be a Mid-term Evaluation Report (no more than 50 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes). Annex I shows a sample outline of an Evaluation Report.

### 5.0 Methodology and Evaluation Approach

#### 5.1 Involvement of Stakeholders in the Evaluation Process

The preliminary results of the evaluation will be shared with all key stakeholders, from donors to community partners and beneficiaries. This review approach is intended to engage multiple actors, within as well as outside the project, in the learning process. For example, project partners, having been presented with the preliminary results, will assist the evaluation team to identify Key Questions and Issues (KQI), conduct further research where necessary, analyze findings and make recommendations. The evaluator will play the role of facilitator or mentor in this participatory review, conducting workshops, guiding the process at critical junctures and consolidating the final report. Experience has shown that establishing a cooperative relationship between project partners and the evaluation team increases the likelihood of the project partners adopting and achieving the intended objectives.

#### 5.2 Establishment of core learning team

To improve stakeholder engagement in the review process, a “core learning team” will be introduced to steer the evaluation process. The core learning team will serve as the direct focal point for the evaluation team. The core learning team will be composed of:

- the key executing and implementing agency and project staff;
- the managers and key staff of the Project;
- the Senior International Project Advisor and the relevant members of the consultancy team (national and international); and
- the UNDP task manager of the project.

Cooperation between the core learning team and the evaluation team will not only increase the quality and relevance of the evaluation, but also increase ownership of and commitment to the evaluation exercise by the project partners. Again, this should lead to a greater adoption of the evaluation output. The core learning team’s main purposes are threefold:

- discuss the draft evaluation report and the preliminary findings and develop the related follow up plan to implement recommendations;
- plan the process leading to negotiation and approval of the agreement/understanding among the partners on the results of the evaluation; and
- ensure that recommendations of the MTE are, to the extent possible, adopted and implemented for the remainder of the project.

#### 5.3 Evaluation Process

The steps below outline the major phases and activities in the Evaluation process. This is only intended to be a guide to the evaluation team in formulating their approach, methodology and timetable. The consultants engaged to undertake the Evaluation will be given some flexibility to modify the processes and approaches as they see fit.

**Briefing:** A general briefing will be conducted for the evaluation team, the Executing Agency and the management office of the Zagros Project, in order to contextualize the activities and scope of the Evaluation.

**Preliminary review process:** Stocktaking of existing knowledge (identifying key stakeholders, role of partners, key sources of information, reports, understanding key challenges, opportunities and expected outcomes).

Desk review of project progress to date: Preliminary assessment, on the basis of information available, of key issues to be addressed (refer section 4, above).

Field work and further investigations: This phase aims to assist in the process of making preliminary findings about the effectiveness and relevance of interventions/activities, and has a number of components:

- determine expertise required – this will include an assessment of the need for consultants;
- determine modality of field works and methodology of surveys (partners are encouraged to consider the role of community-based organizations in this exercise) to generate information against baseline, including information interpretation;
- conduct field work;
- generate draft report and draft recommendations. This has the following elements:
  - agreements on conclusions, recommendations and follow-up actions (to be determined jointly between evaluation team and key stakeholders through a consultation process),
  - articulation of lessons learned, and
  - share draft Evaluation report with various stakeholder groups for review and validation;
- generate and disseminate Evaluation report. This will involve:
  - evaluation team to prepare the Evaluation report through the UNDP Country Office, after considering inputs from stakeholder groups,
  - debriefing with executing agency, core learning team and core project partners. This debriefing will provide a consolidated picture of the review findings, recommendations and lessons learned from the review process,
  - Evaluation Report will be submitted to the UNDP (Country Office, Regional Centre and Headquarters) and will be subsequently posted in the GEF website,
  - the Evaluation Report will be shared with the GEF independent Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and as a public document,
  - Implementing Partner will disseminate the final report to national stakeholder groups,
  - project management team will be responsible for the implementation of the recommendations, and
  - the evaluation team will also be asked to present key findings in the UNDP Delivery Task Team meeting.

#### 5.4 Evaluation methodology

Methodologies for conducting the evaluation will include but not be limited to the following:

- desk review of key documentation, including project materials such as the project document, consultant reports, annual and quarterly work plans and reports, field reports, monitoring reports, financial reports and correspondence, as well as relevant policy documents and laws and reports of other projects, researchers and conservation organizations;
- briefing with UNDP, Department of Environment (at central and local levels), GEF Operational Focal point and other stakeholders;
- groups interviews, questionnaires and other approaches for collecting and analyzing data;
- consultations with major donors and national institutions involved in natural resources management activities;
- field visits to selected project sites, to meet with local project staff, government counterparts and the general public, to assess the extent to which the project is addressing their needs effectively and how it could address their needs better;
- workshops to discuss and agree upon the findings and recommendations.

#### 6.0 Implementation Arrangements

An overview of the various roles and responsibilities is set out below:

UNDP CO:

- helps to initiate and finalize the TOR, recruit consultants in consultation with the Project Office and UNDP/GEF, and finalize the agenda for the mission;
- is responsible for all logistical and administrative arrangements; and
- Communicates with National Project Director/Manager to facilitate the mission.

National Project Director of the Department of Environment will:

- assist in coordinating the evaluation mission;
- help to review and provide inputs and insights on the findings of the evaluation team;
- chair meetings/workshops in the evaluation process and circulate the final report to national stakeholders;
- review and endorse the TOR of the Mid term Evaluation, assist to coordinate the evaluation mission, and facilitate consultation between the evaluation team and relevant stakeholders.

#### 7.0 Composition of Review Team

The Evaluation team will consist of one international consultant and one national consultant:

- Biodiversity Specialist with knowledge and experience in Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Landscape based approaches (international).
- Environment and natural resource management specialist with knowledge in participatory work with local communities (national or local consultant).

The International Consultant will be designated as team leader and will carry overall responsibility for organizing and completing the review and delivering the final report. Both consultants will be asked to work on the project from home for a number of days before the team leader arrives in the country, and the team leader will be employed to complete the final report. The national consultant will assist in terms of translation/interpretation services, some logistical arrangements and technical analysis.

#### 7.1 Team Leader

- International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Landscape based approaches.
- A minimum of 15 years relevant experience is required.
- Experience in the review of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or GEF or other United Nations development agencies and major donors.
- Experience in project design, project cycle management, and project monitoring and evaluation.
- Have a broad based knowledge and experience related to capacity building, community development and natural resource management.
- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues and draw practical conclusions.
- An ability to assess institutional capacity and incentives.
- Understanding of political, economic, institutional issues associated with protected areas management and good environmental governance within the Iranian context.
- Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills and ability to work in a team.
- Experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.

#### 7.2 Environment and Natural Resources Management Specialist

- National consultant with academic and professional background knowledge in participatory work with local communities, with extensive experience in biodiversity conservation.
- A minimum of 8 years relevant working experience is required.
- Experience in implementation of technical assistance projects.
- Skills in community based natural resource management, rural livelihood development
- Knowledge and experience of social mobilization
- Knowledge of landscape based approaches and biodiversity mainstreaming
- Excellent English writing and communication skills
- Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills and ability to work in a team

### 8.0 Budget and Finance

The budget needed for this exercise is estimated to be approximately US\$[TBD]. This will cover the evaluation team's fees and expenses over a period of 25 working days, together with the costs of organizing workshops/meetings to conduct stakeholder consultation, travel and report publication. Please refer to Annex II for the Budget Plan.

### 9.0 Tentative Mission Schedule

It is suggested that the maximum period of the Mid Term Evaluation is 25 working days, covering the period between 15 October and 30 December 2010. A draft of the review report will be submitted to UNDP for further circulation and review by no later than 20 November 2010, with an opportunity to make detailed comments until 30 November 2010. The evaluation team will then work from home to consolidate those comments and prepare a final report by mid December 2010. It is anticipated that the final report will be published in January 2011. Please refer to Annexes B and C for Key Milestones and the Tentative Mission Schedule.

<b>Annex I</b>	<b>Sample Outline</b>
<b>Annex II</b>	<b>Budget Plan</b>
<b>Annex III</b>	<b>Key Milestones</b>
<b>Annex IV</b>	<b>Tentative Mission Schedule [dates to be provided by the project office]</b>
<b>Annex V</b>	<b>Key People/Organizations to Meet [To be completed by the project]</b>
<b>Annex VI</b>	<b>Contribution to GEF Strategic Targets in Biodiversity</b>
<b>Annex VII</b>	<b>Indicative List of Key Documents for Review</b>



## ANNEX II.a

## MTE ITINERARY ACHIEVED

Date	Place	MTE Activity
20-21 January	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTE Consultant arrives in Tehran</li> <li>Desk review of documents</li> </ul>
22 January	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings with NPD, NPM, Project staff</li> <li>Meeting with DoE Directors and Bureau Heads</li> </ul>
23-24 January	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings with Project staff</li> <li>Meetings with MFA, MoAJ, NAO, FRWO, CHTO</li> <li>Meeting with other DoE Project Managers</li> </ul>
25 January	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk work and drafting</li> <li>UNDP Security Briefing</li> </ul>
26 January	Tehran Isfahan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with Project staff</li> <li>Travel to Isfahan</li> </ul>
27 January	Isfahan Semirom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with government agencies, Isfahan Province</li> <li>Travel to Semirom</li> </ul>
28 January	Sivar Village Khafr Village Shahr-e Kord	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village meetings and visits to surrounding areas</li> <li>Travel to Shahr-e Kord</li> </ul>
29 January	Gel-e Sefid Village Karoon valley, Helen PA (Madan to Jozestan villages) Heidarabad Village Shahr-e Kord	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village meetings and visits to surrounding areas</li> <li>Travel to Shahr-e Kord</li> </ul>
30 January	Shahr-e Kord Chaghakhor Wetland Yasuj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attended Project training for DoE Game Guards</li> <li>Meeting with government agencies, Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari Province</li> <li>Meeting with DoE Director General</li> <li>Visit to Chaghakhor Wetland</li> </ul>
31 January	Yasuj Dasht-e Raz Village Dehbar-Aftab Village Shiraz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with government agencies, Kohgiluyeh va Boyer-Ahmad Province</li> <li>Village meetings and visits to surrounding areas</li> <li>Travel to Shiraz</li> </ul>
01 February	Shiraz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with government agencies, Fars Province</li> </ul>
02 February	Tang-e Bostanak Village Margoos Village Isfahan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village meetings and visits to surrounding areas</li> <li>Travel to Isfahan</li> </ul>
03 February	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel to Tehran</li> </ul>
04-07 February	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis and drafting</li> <li>Meetings with Project staff</li> <li>MTE Presentation to some PSC members, DoE, Project staff</li> <li>Meeting with DoE NPD</li> <li>Meeting with UNDP</li> <li>Post-MTE discussion with Project staff</li> </ul>
08 February	Tehran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTE Consultant departs Tehran</li> </ul>

## ANNEX II.b

## MTE RESPONDENTS

Tehran		22-25 January and 6-7 February
1	Dr. Mohammad-Bagher Sadoogh	DoE, Deputy Head for Natural Environment and Biodiversity National Project Director, Zagros Project
2	Dr. Shahab-oddin Montazami	DoE, D.G. Natural History Museum & Genetic Resources
3	Mr. Hossein Mohammadi	DoE, D.G. Wildlife and Biodiversity Bureau
4	Mrs. Goharshahi	DoE, Deputy of Natural History Museum & Genetic Resources
5	Mr. Morteza Farid	DoE, Head of Habitats & Protected Areas Bureau
6	Mr. Alireza Joorabchian	DoE, National Manager, Asian Cheetah Conservation Project
7	Dr. Ali Nazari-Doost	DoE, National Manager, Wetland Conservation Project
8	Mr. Mohammad-Ali Gorji	DoE, Senior Expert, International Affairs Center
9	Mr. Mostafa Sakhaee	CHTO, Advisor of Investment Deputy Division
10	Mr. Houshang Jazi	(FRWO) Former Public Participation Advisor Zagros Project
11	Mr. Mazyar Movassaghi	FRWO, Head of Forestry and Forest Resources Group
12	Mrs. Mojgan Jamshidi	Journalist
13	Mr. Abbas Golriz	MFA, Counselor GEF Alternate Focal Point
14	Mr. Ahmad Dehghan	MoAJ, Institute for Research, Planning and Economics
15	Mr. Hassan Samadyar	MoE, Senior Expert, Research Center
16	Mr. Termoor Birjandi	NAO, Director of Production Office
17	Mr. Mir vali Safarzade	NAO, Head
18	Mrs. Farzaneh Vahadti-Rad	NAO, Technical Expert
19	Ms. Consuelo Vidal	UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative
20	Mr. Saied Ferdowsi	UNDP Environment Program
21	Ms. Laylanaz Shajii	UNDP, E&E
22	Ms. Laleh Daraie	UNDP, National Coordinator, GEF Small Grants Program
23	Mr. Mehdi Kamyab	UNDP, Team Leader Environment, Energy and Disaster Management
24	Mrs. Shirin Abolghasemi	Zagros Project, National Project Manager
25	Mr. Bahram Zehzad	Zagros Project, Senior National Advisor
26	Mr. M. Reza Khosravi	Zagros Project, M&E Consultant
27	Mr. Crawford Prentice	Zagros Project, International Advisor
28	Mr. Hooshang Ziaee	Zagros Project, Biodiversity National Advisor
29	Mr. Pouyan Cranmanesh	Zagros Project, Economics Officer
30	Mrs. Parisa Pajouhesh	Zagros Project, Enterprise Consultant
31	Mr. Mehrdad Moghadam	Zagros Project, Financial Officer
32	Dr. Mohammad Farhat	Zagros Project, National Inter-sectoral Coordinator
Esfahan Province		27 January
33	Mrs. Maryam Farahmand	DoE, Deputy of Natural Environment Provincial Coordinator, Zagros Project
34	Mr. Ahmad Lahijan-zade	DoE, Director General
35	Mr. Ahmad-Reza Molaee	CHTO, Deputy
36	Mr. Mohammad Azad	FRWO, Deputy of Watershed Office, Natural Resources and Watershed Authority
37	Mr. Faizollah Rahnama	FRWO, Director General, Natural Resources and Watershed Authority
38	Mr. Saman Mokhtarian	Housing Foundation, Senior Expert
39	Mr. Hossein Karamian	MoE, Deputy for Water Resources Basic Study Office
40	Mr. Mohammad- Ali Torfe	MoE, Head of Water Regional Company
41	Mrs. Farnaz Bozorgnia	Zagros Project, Technical Expert

<b>Sivar Village, Esfahan Province</b>			<b>28 January</b>
42	Mr. Naderali Reisian	Head of Village	
43	Mr. Sharif Amirian	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
44	Mr. Darab Olae	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
45	Mr. Asghar Reisian	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
46	Mr. Ghazanfar Reisian	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
47	Mr. Gholamreza Khorram-Doost	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
48	Mr. Eynolla Reisian	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
49	Mr. Behzad Amiri	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
50	Mr. Malek- Hossein Reisian	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
51	Mr. Alinaghi Amiri	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
52	Mr. Ali Amiri	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
53	Mr. Faramarz Reisisan	Member of Zagros Project Management Committee	
<b>Khafr Village, Esfahan Province</b>			<b>28 January</b>
54	Mr. Korosh Moosavi	Farmer	
55	Mr. Easa Moosavi	Member of Conflict Resolution Council (Sabzyaran NGO Member)	
56	Mr. Morad Moosavi	Member of Islamic Council	
57	Mr. Yadollah Emadi	Member of Conflict Resolution Council	
58	Mr. Asaollah Jamali	Drugstore Staff	
59	Mr. Seyyad Majid Moosavi	Head of Village	
60	Mr. Gholam- Hossein Jamali	Farmer	
<b>Gelsefid Village, Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari Province</b>			<b>29 January</b>
61	Mr. Human Freydoon- Nejad	Head of Islamic Council	
62	Mr. Mohammad- Javad Khalilian	Member of Islamic Council	
63	Mr. Ezatollah Reisian	Farmer	
64	Mr. Behnam Eghbali	Member of village cooperative	
65	Mr. Hojjat Eghbali	Villager	
66	Mr. Alireza Soltani	DoE game guard	
67	Mr. Shabazi	DoE game guard	
68	Mr. Farzad Mohammadi	Member of village cooperative	
69	Mr. Masood Alizade	Member of village cooperative	
70	Mr. Sfandiar Hatamian	Head of village Cooperative	
71	Mr. Alisaleh Heydarian	Member of Islamic Council	
<b>Heydar-Abad Village, Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari Province</b>			<b>29 January</b>
72	Mr. Safar Malekpoor	Head of Islamic Council	
73	Mr. Azizollah Sohrabi	Village Coordinator in Zagros Project	
74	Mr. Ghaffar Bagherzdae	Headman of Village	
75	Mr. Jafar Jafari	Villager	
95	20 other participants		
<b>Biodiversity Training Workshop</b> Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari Chaghakhor Wetland			<b>30 January</b>
120	25 DoE Game Guards		
<b>Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari Province</b>			<b>30 January</b>
121	Mr. Alireza Nazarian	DoE, Deputy for Natural Environment	
122	Dr. Saieed Yoosf-Pour	DoE, Director General	
123	Mr. Farjam Samiee	CHTO, Expert	
124	Mr. Ataollah Ebrahimi	FRWO, Director General, Natural Resources & Watershed Authority	
125	Mr. Sharam Jazayeri	FRWO, Head, Forest Office, Natural Resources & Watershed Authority	

126	Mr. Hamid-Reza Mansouri	MoAJ, Head of Horticultural Section
127	Mr. Abdolla Fazeli	MoE, Regional Water Company, Protection & Providing Water
128	Mrs. Zahra Karimi	MoE, Senior Expert, Water Regional Company
129	Dr. Ali Jafari	Zagros Project, Technical Expert
<b>Kohgilooye va Boyer- Ahmad Province</b>		<b>31 January</b>
130	Mr. Mohammad- Reza Khodarahmi	DoE, Deputy of Natural Environment
131	Mr. Ata Poor-Shirzad	DoE, Director General
132	Mr. Alireza Izadi	CHTO, Director General
133	Mr. Seyyed Mojtaba Amirhoseyni	CHTO, Expert
134	Mr. Jalal Rasooli	FRWO, Technical Deputy, Natural Resources Authority
135	Mr. Seyyad Vali Moosavinejad	IRNA Journalist
136	Mr. Ghaffar Poor Mohammadi	MoAJ, Advisor
137	Mr. Abolghasem Majdzade	MoE, Deputy of Planning Section, Water Regional Company
138	Mr. Seyyed Amanollah Fattahian	MoE, Expert of Public Affairs Section, Water Regional Company
139	Mr. Fariborz Zarghami	MoE, Head of Protection & Providing Water, Water Regional Company
140	Mr. Majid Alipoor	NAO, Head of Research Office
141	Mr. Saieed Aghaee	Provincial Coordinator, Zagros Project
142	Mr. Seyyed Sharif Hosseini	Provincial Coordinator, Zagros Project
143	Mr. Asghar Mirfardi	Yasooj University
144	Dr. Azizollah Jafari	Yasooj University (Zagros Project Provincial Consultant)
<b>Dasht-e-Raz Village, Kohgilooye va Boyer Ahmad Province</b>		<b>31 January</b>
145	Mr. Hassan Arjmand	Head of Islamic Council
146	Mr. Abbasgholi Arjmand	Member of Islamic Council
147	Mr. Ali- Asghar Arjmand	Farmer
<b>Dehbar-Aftab Village, Kohgilooye va Boyer Ahmad Province</b>		<b>31 January</b>
148	Mr. Hoseyni	Head of Village
149	Mr. Mortazavi	Member of Islamic Council
<b>Shiraz, Fars Province</b>		<b>1 February</b>
150	Dr. Hamze Valavi	DoE, Deputy of Natural Environment
151	Mr. Hossein-Ali Ebrahimi	DoE, Director General
152	Mr. Amin Sayyardoost	CHTO, Ecotourism Expert
53	Mr. Gholam- Reza Mahmoodi	Cooperative Authority, Expert
154	Mr. Hamid Soleymani	FRWO, Senior Expert, Natural Resources Authority
155	Mr. Bahman Izadi	Green Community NGO
156	Mr. Nematollah Amirian	Green Community NGO
157	Mr. Mehrdad Zamanpoor	MoAJ, Natural Resources & Agricultural Research Center
158	Mr. Mohammad-Jafar Sadeghi	MoAJ, Representative
159	Mr. Hadi Abollahi	MoAJ, Senior Expert of Agriculture Section
160	Dr. Ahmad-Reza Easaee	MoE, Head of Environment and Water Quality Section, Water Regional Company
161	Mr. Alamdar Alamdari	Provincial Coordinator, Conservation of Iranian Wetlands Project
162	Mrs. Maryam Alamdari	Provincial Coordinator, Zagros Project
163	Dr. Hamid-Reza Esmaeeli	Shiraz University
164	Mrs. Parya Sajedian	Technical Expert, Zagros Project
165	Mr. Seyyed Hesam Hoseyni	Technical Expert, Zagros Project
<b>Tnge- Bostanak Pilot site, Fars Province</b>		<b>2 February</b>
<b>Margoan Pilot site, Fars Province</b>		<b>2 February</b>

## ANNEX III

## Documents reviewed

(The following list is of documents made available to the MTE. Only those documents written in English were reviewed. Documents available only in Farsi (grey highlight below) were not reviewed.)

Year	Title of Document	English	Farsi
2005	GEF Project Brief	*	
2005	Project Document final	*	
2005	PDF 'B' Support Documents – Summaries from P. Brief Annex II	*	
2005	STAP Review (Tilling) P. Brief Annex II	*	
2006	ATLAS Sheet AWP	*	
2006	Q2 Operational Report - NPM : UNDP	*	
2007	ATLAS Sheet AWP	*	
2007	International Advisor Report (Tiwari 1 <sup>st</sup> report)	*	
2007	Summary Project Progress Report	*	
2007	Project Implementation Report (PIR)	*	
2007	Report on Introductory Workshops to Project Provinces (5 volumes)		*
2007	Project Progress Report by December 2007		*
2007	Project Progress Report by June 2007		*
2007	Site visit report by project team and the IA		*
2008	ATLAS Sheet AWP	*	
2008	International Advisor Report (Budhathoki 1 <sup>st</sup> report)	*	
2008	PSC 1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting Report	*	*
2008	International Advisor Report (Budhathoki 2 <sup>nd</sup> report)	*	
2008	Project Implementation Report (PIR)	*	
2008	Report on Introductory Session to Nomadic Affairs Org.		*
2008	Reports on Biodiversity Festival in Four Provinces		*
2008	Report on revision of project log-frame		*
2008	Project Institutional Structure (63 pages)		*
2008	Project Report		*
2008	Minutes of Joint Meeting with SGP		*
2008	Baseline Studies of Project Pilot Sites (8 volumes)		*
2009	Annual Work Plan & Budget	*	
2009	ATLAS Sheet AWP	*	
2009	Annual Procurement Plan (Excel)	*	
2009	Q1 Work Plan and Progress Report	*	
2009	Q2 Work Plan and Progress Report	*	
2009	.July Revised Inception Report	*	
2009	draft QWP Q4.2009 – Annex from A Fazel 2010 Report	*	
2009	Chief Technical Advisor 1 <sup>st</sup> Report (A Fazel) draft only	*	*
2009	Mountain Biodiversity Resource Centre (MBRC) Structure and Procedure	*	
2009	Project Implementation Report (PIR) Excel	*	
2009	Project Annual Report		*
2009	Second PSC Meeting Report		*
2009	Third PSC Meeting Report		*

Year	Title of Document	English	Farsi
2009	Report on the Progress of the Contingency Plan		*
2009	Summary report on project progress in contingency period		*
2009	Report on Training and Awareness Raising in Esfahan Province		*
2009	Report on PRA Session in Esfahan Province		*
2009	Report on PRA Session in Charmahal Province		*
2009	Report on Biosphere Reserve Site Visit by UNESCO Representative		*
2010	ATLAS Sheet AWP	*	
2010	draft AWP 2010 draft – Annex from A Fazel 2010 Report	*	
2010	Project Implementation Report (PIR) (Excel)	*	
2010	Biodiversity Enterprises Centre(BEC) Strategy	*	*
2010	Q1 Work Plan and Progress Report		*
2010	Project summary report		*
2010	Fourth PSC Meeting Report		*
2010	Biodiversity Baseline Studies (7 series of BD Survey studies)		*
2010	Stakeholder analysis (National and Provincial Levels)		*
2010	Project Comparative Report		*
2010	Project Progress Report		*
2011	Annual Planning and Reporting Package	*	

## ANNEX IV

## PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

from Project Brief (2005) Annex 2.1

Narrative Summary	Indicator	Verification	Baseline	Target (Year)	Assumptions
<b>Overall Goal:</b> The Zagros Mountains Socio-Economy Develops Successfully and Supports Biodiversity Restoration and Conservation					
<b>GEF Project Objective:</b> Conservation of the Biodiversity and the Landscape within the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- % of the Zone under a management regime addressing biodiversity</li> <li>- Number of <u>free range</u> livestock</li> <li>- Population of key species (Persian squirrel, Wolf) is stabilised or slowly increasing</li> <li>- Erosion levels or level vegetative cover in the Zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National and provincial statistics</li> <li>- Departmental Statistics</li> <li>- Project and DoE monitoring</li> <li>- National and provincial statistics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only DoE PA land address biodiversity.</li> <li>- Figures are available</li> <li>- Figures are available for several species in limited areas.</li> <li>- To be determined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 100% of non-urban land subject to some regulations on BD by Y5</li> <li>- Decrease by 25% by Y5</li> <li>- Figures stable or incr. by Y5</li> <li>- Stable by Y5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No significant incr. in environmental threats (e.g. global warming or .... poverty)</li> <li>- No natural crises impacting environment</li> <li>- No influx of refugees...</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> A national institutional and policy framework that is fully supportive of mainstreaming biodiversity into development in the central Zagros mountains	<u>See outputs</u>				
<b>Output 1.1</b> Partnerships established between biodiversity sector and key national and international stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resources mobilised and dedicated to BD conservation from national or international sources</li> <li>- Joint work programmes between DE and MoAJ/MoE/CHTO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial agreements</li> <li>- MoU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only DE finances BD directly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$1mn annually by Year 4</li> <li>- Underway by Year 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International stability</li> <li>- Environmental Fund is approved and financed</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.2</b> National macro and sectoral policies and practices modified/developed to favour sustainable utilisation of Zagros biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tax incentives for sustainable harvesting activities.</li> <li>- Zagros biodiversity mentioned in at least 2 sectors in 5<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan with clear objectives</li> <li>- Existence of legal and implementation framework supporting the integration of BD into national policies and practices in the key sectors, eg guidelines that are operational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reports to NCSD</li> <li>- Fifth Five Year Plan</li> <li>- Reports to NCSD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No examples</li> <li>- Biodiversity mentioned in 4<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, but no effective mainstreaming</li> <li>- As of yet, no implementation framework exists. There are no guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 4</li> <li>- Year 5</li> <li>- Year 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Next Government in Iran is equally in favour of sustainable development</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.3</b> Lessons learnt disseminated across the entire Zagros mountainous region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government departments in at least 7 provinces formally adopt measures and practices and approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 Provinces committed to the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lessons learnt are equally applicable to situation in</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary	Indicator	Verification	Baseline	Target (Year)	Assumptions
	developed under this project				neighbouring provinces
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity is integrated into economic and sectoral programmes and government practices at the Conservation Zone level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Vision for the Conservation Zone issued by political authorities (e.g. proposal for MAB status) and funded by government agencies.</li> <li>- Integrated, participatory monitoring of socio-economic development and biodiversity levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National records</li> <li>- Provincial/Project records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No single coherent vision established for development of region</li> <li>- Monitoring is fragmented and top-down. It is not being use for adaptive management, but simply for accountability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 3</li> <li>- Year 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decentralisation process keeps on track</li> <li>- Zone is compatible with MAB requirements</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.1</b> New Strategy for Development operational, incorporating new vision, and biodiversity (This Output will linked into UNDP Area-Based Development Programme activities in the Zone)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approved Strategy or Vision</li> <li>- Provincial MPOs adopt biodiversity conservation as main element of provincial development</li> <li>- Monitoring (including social, economic and environmental) of vision implementation is effective and used by provincial agencies, and linked to monitoring of the pilot villages (Outcome 3)</li> <li>- MBRC operating sustainably</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- MBRC records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- na</li> <li>- Only Provincial DE support biodiversity</li> <li>- No integrated monitoring. Monitoring does not support adaptive management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 4</li> <li>- Year 3</li> <li>- Year 5</li> <li>- Year 5</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 2.2</b> Effective mechanisms to support village-driven improved livelihood development in the Zone (This Output will support all activities in Outcome 3, and ensure that the lessons, mechanisms and findings of Outcome 3 are suitably disseminated across the entire Zagros region) (This Output will linked into UNDP Area-Based Development Programme activities in the Zone)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity Enterprise Centre (BEC) financially sustainable</li> <li>- The number of non-pilot villages that seek support from BEC.</li> <li>- Government extends BEGP into second cycle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BEC records</li> <li>- Project Records</li> <li>- DoE Records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8 villages will be piloted by Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 5</li> <li>- At least 3 per year by Year 3, and onwards</li> <li>- Year 5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity Enterprise Centre approach is suitable to Zagros region</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.3</b> Biodiversity mainstreamed into water resources sector development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoU between DoE and water organisation</li> <li>- Strategy for mainstreaming approved and operational</li> <li>- Water-user fees transferred to ecosystem protection in 1-2 pilots.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- Provincial and national budgets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/a</li> <li>- N/a</li> <li>- One proposed scheme to transfer 0.1% of water fees from Khuzestan to Chaharmahal province. DOE has little influence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 1</li> <li>- Year 1</li> <li>- At least \$1mn per year, by Year 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National approach to water management continues to evolve to market-oriented approach</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.4</b> Biodiversity mainstreamed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoU between DoE and FRWO units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 1</li> </ul>	



Narrative Summary	Indicator	Verification	Baseline	Target (Year)	Assumptions
into agriculture, rangelands and forestry sectors development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategies for mainstreaming approved and operational</li> <li>- Contribution to economy of biodiversity friendly income-generating activities in the sector.</li> <li>- Reforestation activities directly support biodiversity conservation</li> <li>- Revised provincial framework regarding ownership of rangelands</li> <li>- FRWO reporting to Province and DoE on biodiversity impact and related activities</li> <li>- No. of FRWO financed nature conservation projects jointly managed with DoE</li> <li>- Total value of provincial FRWO projects directly addressing biodiversity</li> <li>- Guidelines and 'Best practices' are regularly used by provincial agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- FRWO records and reporting</li> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- Provincial records</li> <li>- Project Records</li> <li>- Project records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/a</li> <li>- Little cooperation at provincial level between DoE and FRWO. No joint projects</li> <li>- No current guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 1</li> <li>- Years 3 – 5, increases</li> <li>- Year 3 onwards</li> <li>- Year 4 onwards</li> <li>- Year 4 onwards</li> <li>- At least one new project or programme each year, starting Year 3</li> <li>- Year 3</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 2.5</b> Biodiversity mainstreamed into development of the tourism sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoU between DoE and CHTO organisation</li> <li>- Strategy for mainstreaming approved and operational</li> <li>- %ge of domestic tourists respecting and appreciating ecosystem</li> <li>- Guidelines and 'Best practices' are regularly used by provincial agencies and private sector operators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project funded surveys</li> <li>- Project Records</li> <li>- CHTO records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/a</li> <li>- N/a</li> <li>- Baseline almost 0, to be determined through project survey</li> <li>- No current guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 1</li> <li>- Year 1</li> <li>- Increase by 5% per year, starting Year 2</li> <li>- Year 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall tourism sector remains dynamic</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.6</b> Biodiversity conservation tools are effective across the <i>entire Conservation Zone</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protected Area budget</li> <li>- Hunting levels outside of PAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Records of all PAs in Conservation Zone</li> <li>- Project records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Figures are available</li> <li>- Though regulations exist hunting levels are far in excess. Baseline to be determined during Year 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rises 20% annually, starting Year 2</li> <li>- 10% annual reduction estimated starting in Year 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary	Indicator	Verification	Baseline	Target (Year)	Assumptions
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Successful, sustainable, financially replicable models of <i>village designed and village driven</i> approaches to increasing income generation and conserving biodiversity in biodiversity rich areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant improvement in biodiversity status surrounding at least 6 pilot villages Improved socio-economic conditions in at least 6 pilot villages</li> <li>- Level of support for biodiversity conservation at villages across the entire Zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A community-level participatory monitoring framework is to be prepared under this Outcome</li> <li>- Results of polls financed by project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Related surveys were implemented under the PDF project. However, specific details are to be determined at outset of project</li> </ul>		
<b>Output 3.1</b> 8 Selected villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8 villages listed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 of the pilot villages were pre-selected under PDF B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 2</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 3.2</b> Participatory natural resource planning, monitoring and management mechanisms established in each village, with full involvement of local communities, and in cooperation with DoE staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Village Council and DoE staff meet at least 3 times per year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mixed relations between DoE and local people, some conflicts and no formalised agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 2 onwards</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 3.3</b> Long term natural resource management plans for each village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plans approved by Councils and DoE, and fully supported by people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No integrated resource use plans or participatory processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Year 2-3</li> </ul>	-
<b>Output 3.4</b> Plans are implemented, monitored, revised in an iterative manner. (Output 2.6 will provide the technical support to this Output)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local support for and understanding of biodiversity</li> <li>- Improved income of pilot villages</li> <li>- Community monitoring of biodiversity and socio-economic status and trends feeds into regular community decision-making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Funded Surveys</li> <li>- Household income survey</li> <li>- Records of community meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Awareness and understanding of biodiversity as a concept is close to zero</li> <li>- Figures known for 3 villages (from PDF B reports)</li> <li>- Not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To be determined at project outset</li> <li>- As of Year 3, increases 10% annually</li> <li>- As of Year 3</li> </ul>	-
<b>Output 3.5</b> Improved appreciation of biodiversity and its contribution to socio-economic development in villages across the Zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of support for the concept of protected areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protected Area records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not currently measured, but known to be low.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular increases</li> </ul>	-

## Original Project Budget Plan

Outcomes and Outputs	DoE	MoAJ	Co-Financing			UNDP	Total	GEF Funds	Total Funds	
			Other Ministries	NGOs	Private Sector					
1.1 Partnerships established	350	-	-	50	25	-	425	220	645	
1.2 Policies/practices modified	320	70	33	-	-	35	458	250	708	
1.3 Lessons disseminated	420	-	40	40	-	-	500	180	680	
<b>Outcome 1</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1,383</b>	<b>650</b>	<b>2,033</b>	
2.1 Overall development paradigm and strategy	380	125	85	-	-	25	615	350	965	
2.1 Support for alternative livelihood development	225	100	-	270	-	50	645	680	1,325	
2.1 Biodiversity mainstreamed into water sector	110	100	32	-	-	-	242	260	502	
2.4 Biodiversity mainstreamed into A,R,F sectors	140	175	-	-	-	-	315	280	595	
2.5 Biodiversity mainstreamed into tourism sector	250	-	55	-	20	-	325	190	515	
2.6 Conservation tools effective across CZLCZ	800	-	40	-	-	-	840	440	1,280	
<b>Outcome 2</b>	<b>1,905</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>2,982</b>	<b>2,200</b>	<b>5,182</b>	
3.1 8 selected villages	55	50	30	20	-	-	155	110	265	
3.2 Planning and management established	350	-	-	-	-	50	400	120	520	
3.3 NRM plans for each village	280	-	-	-	-	-	280	280	560	
3.4 Plans are implemented	270	100	100	-	-	-	470	200	670	
3.5 Communication and Awareness raising	80	25	-	-	-	-	105	80	185	
<b>Outcome 3</b>	<b>1,035</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1,410</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>2,200</b>	
GEF Contribution to M&E								160	160	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,030</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>5,775</b>	<b>3,800</b>	<b>9,575</b>	
	\$ ,000						% Contributions	60	40	100

## ANNEX V.b

## Project Expenditure Record

Output	2006			2007			2008			2009			2010			Total Expend. to date		
	DoE	TRAC	GEF	DoE	TRAC	GEF	DoE	TRAC	GEF	DoE	TRAC	GEF	DoE	TRAC	GEF	DoE	TRAC	GEF
1.1	7,300	1,725	22,635	-	-	9,109	-	8,123	21,980	-	1,250	2,940	-	4,375	7,300	11,098	61,039	
1.2	12,000	-	-	24,500	-	-	24,589	-	4,815	6,300	-	50,776	-	129,425	67,389	-	185,016	
1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	19,300	1,725	22,635	24,500	-	9,109	24,589	8,123	26,795	6,300	1,250	53,716	-	133,800	74,689	11,098	246,055	
2.1	-	-	92,710	-	-	5,892	-	6,681	8	-	1,015	20,710	-	21,138	-	7,696	140,458	
2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250	6,873	-	-	-	-	3,643	-	2,250	10,516	
2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16,043	-	1,000	-	-	17,043	
2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,271	-	101,041	-	-	109,312	
2.6	20,000	-	-	83,032	-	-	44,507	-	-	8,704	-	13,961	-	164,490	156,243	-	178,451	
	20,000	-	92,710	83,032	-	5,892	44,507	8,931	6,881	8,704	1,015	58,985	-	291,312	156,243	9,946	455,780	
3.1	-	-	-	-	-	22,917	-	3,680	18,988	15,013	6,685	6,897	-	3,326	15,013	10,365	52,128	
3.2	-	-	-	38,016	-	-	2,204	-	-	-	-	9,790	-	-	40,220	-	9,790	
3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,470	-	-	4,203	-	-	-	-	12,673	-	-	
3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,341	-	-	-	-	10,341	
3.5	-	-	-	27,339	-	-	41,886	-	-	6,465	-	30,942	-	-	75,690	-	30,942	
	-	-	-	65,355	-	22,917	52,560	3,680	18,988	25,681	6,685	57,970	-	3,326	143,596	10,365	103,201	
4.0	10,700	-	55,713	25,513	3,885	153,949	34,970	930	113,780	-	7,589	260,912	-	1,337	71,183	13,741	781,951	
	50,000	1,725	171,058	198,400	3,885	191,867	156,626	21,664	166,444	40,685	16,539	431,583	200,000	1,337	626,035	45,150	1,586,987	