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### The evaluation mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating institute /</td>
<td>KEK-CDC Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consulting firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Dieter Zürcher, KEK-CDC Consultants, Team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umed Bulbulshoev (Tajikistan) and Frank Jie Ding (China) as local consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The development measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title according to the offer</th>
<th>Methodological Support for Political Reform Processes for the Development of Mountain Regions (Himalaya-Karakoram-Hindukush-Pamir)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>AD06600000 (InWEnt) und PN 2007.2071.4 (GIZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phases</td>
<td>Phase 1: 4/2006 – 12/2009 (InWEnt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Phase 1/2010 – 12/2011 (InWEnt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging Phase: 1/2012 – 12/2012 (GIZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>Preperation Phase 0,040 Mio. €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1 (incl. Extension) 9,486 Mio. €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging Phase 0,175 Mio. €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total costs 9,701 Mio. €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective as per</td>
<td>(i) The professional behaviour of decision makers and development managers is changed, (ii) the performance through public governmental and non-governmental organisations is improved, (iii) as well as the cooperation of relevant actor groups across national boundaries is intensified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the offer, for ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development measures also</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the objective for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead executing agency</td>
<td>ICIMOD – International Centre for Mountain Develop-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementing organisations (in the partner country) | China: Tibet Academy of Agricultural and Animal Science (TAAAS) and Xinjiang Academy of Agricultural Science (XAAS)  
Nepal: National Planning Commission (NPC)  
Pakistan: Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP), a project of the Aga Khan Foundation  
Tajikistan: Mountain Societies Development Support Programme (MSDSP), a project of the Aga Khan Foundation |
| Other participating development organisations | Centre for Development Country Research, Free University of Berlin  
*Aga Khan Development Network (AKDN)*  
*Commission Internationale pour la Protection des Alpes (CIPRA)*  
GTZ (until the merger of GTZ, InWEnt and DED to form GIZ in 2011) |
| Target groups as per the offer | Disadvantaged and marginalised population in peripheral mountain regions (Himalaya, Hindukush, Karakoram and Pamir, overall around 55 million people). Intermediaries are the 65 participants of the International Leadership Training, the 4,000 participants of trainings, workshops, conferences and study tours. This includes several hundred trained middle cadres and leaders of state agencies and non-governmental organisations. Intermediaries are also the strengthened public and non-profit organisational nits that can provide better services for the beneficiaries. |
## The rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The overall rating of the project is good (Level 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On a scale of 1 (very good, significantly better than expected) to 6 (the project/program is useless, or the situation has deteriorated on balance)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: 2; Effectiveness: 2; Impact: 3; Efficiency: 2; Sustainability: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context of the programme: The programme for the development of mountain regions in the Himalaya - Hindukush - Karakoram - Pamir (HHKP) area lasted from 2006 until 2012. At the beginning it was a capacity building programme of InWEnt in the domain of agricultural and mountain development. With the merger of GTZ, InWEnt and DED the programme became a human capacity development programme of GIZ in 2011.

Concept of the project: The intervention was planned in 2005 and the overall objective aimed at contributing to the avoidance or mitigation of environmental and socio-economic crises and to sustainable development of natural resources in the mountain regions of the programme area. The targeted countries and provinces included Xinjiang and Tibet in China, Gilgit-Baltistan in Pakistan, Gorno Badakhshan in Tajikistan as well as Nepal. Furthermore, cross-border cooperation should be promoted in peripheral and relatively unstable regions characterized by ethnical problems. The human capacity development (HCD) programme aimed at providing support for achieving three programme objectives. Objective 1: “The professional behaviour of decision makers and development managers is changed.” Objective 2: “The performance of public governmental and non-governmental organisations is improved.” Objective 3: “The cooperation of relevant actor groups across national boundaries is intensified.” The programme provided the local partner organisations methodological and technical support in the following areas: (i) change management for the implementation of sectoral reforms and corresponding development strategies through various actor groups and local organisations, (ii) sustainable management of natural resources in the national framework and/or on local level, and (iii) cross border experience exchange and cooperation for conflict prevention and crisis management. Towards this, the experiences of the Alps (incl. the Alpine Convention) should have contributed show cases and best practices which were explored for an adapted application in the partner organisations. The cross-sectoral programme strived for sensitization and improvement of the professional behavior of decision makers of public administrations and civil society. They should be capacitated to act in an interdisciplinary, participatory and regional manner. The programme had various cooperation partners in each country as well as strategic partners in Europe. The lead executing agency of the intervention was the International Centre for Mountain Development (ICIMOD) in Kathmandu, Nepal. The national partners were: Tibet Academy of Agricultural and Animal Science (TAAAS) and Xinjiang Academy of Agricultural Science (XAAS) in China, National Planning Commission (NPC) in Nepal, Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP) in Pakistan and the Mountain Societies Development Support Programme (MSDSP) in Tajikistan. Other involved partners were: Centre for Development Country Research (ZELF) at the Fee University of Berlin, Aga Khan Development Network (AKDN) und die Commission Internationale pour la Protection des Alpes (CIPRA).
The total expenditures of the programme were € 9.7 million over a period of six years from 2006-2011, including an extension of the first phase by two years (2010/2011). A subsequent bridging phase in 2012 put the focus on alumni networking and was affiliated to the regional project of the German technical cooperation at the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD).

**Technical implementation:** The programme for mountain region development applied various formats of the Human Capacity Development (HCD) concept: International Leadership Training (ILT) for young leaders consisting of a one-year training in Germany and the Alps, which linked theoretical knowledge with practical experience. An important instrument were the transfer projects which the participants implemented after their return to their home countries. National workshops and trainings included trainings of trainers in change management for organizations and corresponding workshops in the four countries as well as other thematic training activities. Regional workshops supported the cross-border exchange of experiences and best practices on the topic of integrated tourism concepts in Pakistan-Xinjiang (2008) and Nepal-Tibet (2009) and nomadism and management of grasslands in Tajikistan-Xinjiang-Pakistan (2010) and in Tibet-Nepal (2010). Three international conferences were held under the label "meeting of minds" for the regional cooperation in mountain regions and sustainable development policies. These included the postulation of the "Feldafing Manifesto" (2009) on experiences of regional cooperation in the mountain development. Five alumni networks were established from 2010 onwards in the four countries and some were registered as organizations.

**Approach of the evaluation:** The evaluation was conducted on behalf of GIZ by Dieter Zürcher (KEK-CDC Consultants), Umed Bulbulshoev (Tajikistan) and Frank Jie Ding (China). A field mission to Tajikistan (Khorog in Gorno-Badakhshan) and China (Urumqi in Xinjiang province) took place between 3rd and 18th of November 2013. The evaluation design consisted of: (1) an online survey inviting 200 members of the alumni networks with 54 respondents from all four countries, (2) case studies in Gorno-Badakhshan and Xinjiang about the effects of the programme on individual, organizational and societal level, (3) interviews with 30 of the totally 65 ILT participants in all four countries, and (4) 37 interviews with resource persons from partner organizations and/or experts of all four countries.

**Assessment of relevance:** The programme was conceptually and programmatically relevant because the Human Capacity Development approach addressed the needs of the partner organisations and because the Alps provide impressive and high-quality illustrative material (theoretical and practical) for participatory and cross-border cooperation. Furthermore, the intervention corresponded with the then priorities of the Ministry for Cooperation and Development (BMZ) regarding biodiversity, natural resources and climate change. In light of the heterogeneous partner landscape, the ethnic and religious tensions and the presence of
movements for autonomy, the intervention was classified as “high” risk. The local partners have considered the prioritization of the issues (sustainable development, tourism and pastoralism) as relevant and appropriate to their needs. In particular, the teaching of participatory planning approaches and cross-sectoral collaboration as well as the study of best practices was very relevant for the local partners. The selection of the four partner countries was influenced by the then framework conditions. The programme included four partner countries of which three were ICIMOD member countries (except Tajikistan). India, one of the most important ICOMOD members, was not part of the set-up which was accepted by all stakeholders at the beginning. This asymmetry, however, limited the programmes’ relevance over time. The assessment of the **relevance** is **good (level 2)**.

**Assessment of effectiveness:** The programme has fully achieved its intended capacity development objectives and further qualified approximately 4,000 experts, out of which 30% were women. Objective 1: the ILT participants and also the other qualified experts apply newly gained competencies in areas like planning, project management, leadership and communication regularly in their daily work. Most of them analyze problems from new perspectives and know practical sustainability concepts e.g. for the use of natural resources, tourism but also in other policy domains. The capacity development effect at individual level is high. The new qualifications have opened new career paths: around 50 of the 65 ILT participants were promoted at least once after their return (and two became ministers in Gorno-Badakhshan and Gilgit Baltistan). Objective 2: at the organizational and systemic level, there is punctual evidence for changes such as adjusted planning systems, dissemination of participatory approaches, or influence on new sectoral policies. For the local partner organizations from China (Xinjiang and Tibet), Nepal, Pakistan and Tajikistan the access to capacity development and international concepts of mountain region development based on the experience of the Alps and the Alpine Convention was instructive and very useful. Objective 3: the HCD programme for mountain region development was a unique cross-border learning platform from the perspective of local partners. The established contacts have contributed to intensify the cooperation beyond borders. The publications, which were translated into several languages, are reference documents. The cross-cutting issues have been adequately implemented and the proportion of women was supported in all activities but remained small (between 15 and 35%, depending on the HCD format). However, there are traditionally only few women public decision-makers in these thematic fields. The participating women were highly motivated and well qualified. The female ILT participants from Tajikistan have seen a relatively high drop-out rate (and emigration). The sustainable use of natural resources was a key cross-cutting issue in all training activities. The assessment of **effectiveness** is **good (level 2)**.
Assessment of the contribution to overarching developmental results (impact): The HCD formats have changed the perspectives of the participants significantly. They have become more open minded for new solutions and this has for example promoted interdepartmental cooperation in China or cooperation between different actors within a region and the development of mountain regions has a higher significance for poverty reduction today. The programme has fostered the cooperation among the various actors locally, regionally and internationally and has contributed positively to cross-border cooperation in the region. Through this networking, the intervention has contributed to new contacts and working relations and thus made a small but important contribution to sustainable development and a more stable and secure HKHP region. On organizational level, there exist several evidences in the two case studies that a transfer of individual learning took place to the organizational or sector policy level, albeit on a selective scale. The outreach is difficult to assess and limited due to the vast project region and the shorter than envisaged duration of the programme. The assessment of the impact is satisfactory (level 3).

Assessment of efficiency: The project was efficiently implemented and steered. The project team in Feldafing consisted of only two part-time positions and there were collaborators in the field who at the same time implemented also other projects. The partners and the ILT participants have contributed substantial own resources to programme activities. The complementarity to other German projects or projects of other donors was well coordinated and without problems in China, Pakistan and Tajikistan. In Nepal, the interface to the project of the German technical cooperation with the ICIMOD was more difficult, because the National Planning Commission (NPC) as national partner was weak and therefore ICIMOD, as a lead executing agency of the intervention, had to take over this role and thus had several roles. The ILT were conducted in German and the training costs were relatively expensive with investments of about € 50,000 per participant. The German language skills were, however, essential for the understanding of the dynamics and models of mountain development in the Alps. The higher costs were explained with the special setting of the mountain development programme, with participants from four countries and two internships in the German speaking parts of the Alps. The overhead costs appeared to be rather high with more than 40% of expenditures. The costs for regional workshops correspond to international standards. Overall, the programme offered actor-specific training formats taking care of the trainees’ functions and positions. The evaluation of the efficiency is good (level 2).

Evaluation of sustainability: The sustainability at individual level is assessed as very good. In Xinjiang for example, all ILT participants and most of the qualified persons of the local partners are still involved in mountain area development issues and also in the other countries the continuity is surprisingly high. At the organizational and societal level also evidence for lasting changes can be found, as e.g. the spread of participatory planning
methodologies for village development (Tajikistan) or various sectoral policies in the agricultural sector (Xinjiang). Originally it was planned to have additional phases in order to achieve long-term intended effects (e.g., the mitigation of ecological and socio-economic crises or stabilisation of the security situation). However, an extension of the project in 2009 consisted of only two years. The programme promoted the sustainable formation of ILT and expert clusters in Tajikistan and Xinjiang, but due to a lack of a longer-term perspective it led to no thematic continuity of cross-border cooperation (e.g., in the tourism sector). The ILT alumni still exchange views informally and across borders. The national networks, however, were only temporarily active and are not able to survive without external support. Only in Nepal and Pakistan exist registered national alumni organizations, but they have severe funding problems. The assessment of sustainability is satisfactory (level 3).

Overall assessment: The HCD programme for mountain region development is considered as relevant and demand-driven. Agenda-setting and the mixture of theoretical and practical orientation was good and corresponded to the needs of the various partners. The capacity development in a cross-border context has provided important learning impulses, has influenced organizational practices and sector policies and has qualified around 4,000 persons, out of which almost 30% were women. The intervention has accomplished its capacity development objectives at individual level. The organisational practices and sectoral policies were selectively influenced, with positive results for the HHKP mountain areas and their inhabitants. The assessment of the impact in the four countries is difficult to trace. The target population benefited at most indirectly through better and more participative planning and implementation processes for services of public authorities or NGOs. However, the alumni concept and the cross-border cooperation could not be sufficiently institutionally anchored, as the project had a too short duration of six years. In 2012, the activities of the mountain development programme were incorporated into the long lasting German technical cooperation project at ICIMOD. With the merger of GTZ, InWEnt and DED in 2011 the allocation mechanism for the HCD formats was changed to a demand-side procedure. This resulted in a sharp drop in the demand for ILT and also regional approaches found less interest. The merger resulted in a “disordered exit” of a basically good programme. The overall rating of the mountain development programme is good (level 2).

The following recommendations for GIZ are lessons learned in view of future similar projects. Some of the recommendations were also addressed in earlier evaluations of HCD interventions.¹

¹ HCD-Programmes http://www.giz.de/en/aboutgiz/516.html
**Intervention-related recommendations**

1. Based on partner needs the German technical cooperation should define new HCD interventions for the Western part of the HKHP region (Pakistan, Tajikistan, Xinjiang as well as Afghanistan und Kyrgyzstan). A potential political agency is the Agha Khan Foundation (incl. the University of Central Asia). In the Eastern part (Nepal, Tibet, Bhutan and India) such activities would have to be designed and aligned with current ICIMOD strategies.

2. The institutional establishment of regional cooperation in an area with delicate boundary issues and local movements for more autonomy requires time (minimally 10-12 years) and mutual trust. The selection of core topics requires a certain continuity of policy assessment and development so that tangible results or policy changes and their effects in implementation are becoming evident.

3. Relevant national actors must be represented in the steering committee because regional authorities can generally not make any international commitments.

4. For similar regional interventions cooperation partnerships between the GIZ headquarters in Germany and local partners, in close cooperation with the own country offices in the field, could be established. This requires a certain continuity of country managers and programme responsibles.

5. M&E data and information for output and outcome indicators as well as the finances (incl. partner contributions) should be collected and analyzed consistently throughout the project duration and these should be gender-specific.

**Recommendations regarding the implementation of HCD formats**

Due to the merger of InWEnt, DED and GTZ the HCD formats are presently redesigned within GIZ and the earlier International Leadership Trainings are phased-out. The following recommendations for HCD formats can be deducted nevertheless:

6. It should be explored whether the alumni networks of the HCD programme for mountain region development can be integrated into the regional sector network “natural resources and rural development” in Asia. The qualified resource persons in the areas of sustainable development and management of natural resources (especially the ILT graduates) have a high affinity to German technical cooperation are well qualified and are highly motivated and committed. This network of experts also demands a continuous coaching and a regular exchange of experiences, not only via internet and social media.
7. In areas where Germany or the German speaking countries have comparative advantages, like for example in mountain region development in the Alps, need-oriented HCD formats should be offered for the various hierarchical levels of partner organisations (young promising staff, middle cadres and experienced leaders and policy makers) mostly in English (Mehrhierarchienansatz). This requires a pro-active consideration of HCD formats of country managers and programme managers before and during the planning of interventions.

8. Long-term trainings (up to three months) require English as teaching language and the provision of certified credit points. A closer cooperation with German and/or local universities (e.g. with the Free University Berlin in this domain) should be considered. This should include the adoption of suitable approaches of blended learning (e-learning in combination with face-to-face workshops) for further qualification programmes in GIZ interventions.

9. The specific strengths of the HCD approach should be documented and pro-actively integrated into the planning for new regional programmes (e.g. the collectivization of thematic knowledge and soft skills for planning and implementation of sectoral policies and cross-cutting issues).
Annex 1: Target-actual comparison of the achievement on the basis of the mandate indicators and of the status of the BMZ/DAC policy markers

### Programme Objective:
1. The professional behaviour of decision makers and development managers is changed.
2. The performance through public governmental and non-governmental organisations is improved.
3. The cooperation of relevant actor groups across national boundaries is intensified.

### Indicator 1:
ILT graduates have advanced in their careers (individual level).

**STATUS:** Achieved

### Indicator 2:
ILT graduates influence on the design of sectoral and cross-cutting policies (individual level).

**STATUS:** Largely achieved

### Indicator 3:
There is evidence for improved policy making concepts through validating best practices/experiences disseminated by the programme (organisational level).

**STATUS:** Partly achieved

### Indicator 4:
Change in regional cooperation frameworks (realities, MoUs, projects, etc.) for mitigating risks and promoting sustainable development and cross-border cooperation between 2006 and 2012 (system level).

**STATUS:** Partly achieved

### Indicator 5:
Increased level of transboundary cooperation and exchange among the national partner organisations and with ICIMOD (intensity of contacts, joint activities) between 2006 and 2012 (system level).

**STATUS:** Achieved

### Outcome Target 1:
Selected non-governmental and governmental development agents at national, regional and communal level are sensitised for comprehensive and participatory development strategies in planning and implementing national reform processes, have increased their competencies for action and use participatory methods in planning and steering decentralised regional development.

**Indicator 1.1:** Experienced resp. young experts of the target countries conduct own workshops and apply new knowledge and practical experience in their daily work.

**STATUS:** Largely achieved

**Indicator 1.2:** At least 30% of the ILT participants use routinely adjusted methods for the planning and steering of development measures in their organisations.

**STATUS:** Around 80% of the ILT participants apply what they have learned

### Outcome Target 2:
Possibilities for the application of knowledge from the Alpine Convention and their context-specific implementation as well as related best practices are discussed by national decision makers.

**Indicator 2.1:** The experiences gained on the basis of the Alpine Convention are used as basic building blocks for the strategic orientation of development activities.

**STATUS:** Partly achieved

**Indicator 2.2:** Topics of central strategic importance for a sustainable development of mountain regions are completed in the regional context. Concrete policy oriented recommendations are formulated.

**STATUS:** Achieved

### Outcome Target 3:
Through international exchange of experience and trans-border cooperation in provinces of the programme region the interdisciplinary options for strategic planning of relevant actors are broadened.

**Indicator 1:** Policy propositions, or laws for the implementation of development measures in the high mountain region are compiled by the participants and are forwarded to the policy maker on the national and provincial level.

**STATUS:** Largely achieved

**Indicator 2:** Stable networks for an effective, interdisciplinary and regional exchange of experiences are active and used.

**STATUS:** Partly achieved

**Indicator 3:** The degree of the networking of the Alumni is increasing (transboundary contacts, professional exchange).

**STATUS:** Largely achieved

**Indicator 4:** The four country based alumni networks disseminate ILT concepts and best practice experiences at national and international levels.

**STATUS:** Partly achieved

---

### Querschnittsthemen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (G-I)</td>
<td>The teaching of participatory planning and steering concepts was an important subject of the project (e.g., internships) in the Alps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction (SUA)</td>
<td>The project had only an indirect relation to the target group. No target group specific indicators were available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Governance (PD/GG-1)</td>
<td>Sustainable use of natural resources (meadows, national parks) was a main topic of the HCD formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (UR-2)</td>
<td>This label was not relevant for the project. (Use of forest was no priority topic in the project.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical forest (‘yes’)</td>
<td>Not applicable, since there is no partner in the private sector involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppp (no agreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>