

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the “*Strengthening capacity for an environmental information management and monitoring system in Tajikistan*” (PIMS #5198, Atlas # 74005).

The project document was signed between the UNDP Tajikistan and the Committee on Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan. The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

|                          |  |  |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Project Title:           | Strengthening capacity for an environmental information management and monitoring system in Tajikistan   |  |                                      |                                     |
| GEF Project ID:          | 00086552   |  | <u>at endorsement (Million US\$)</u> | <u>at completion (Million US\$)</u> |
| UNDP Project ID:         | 5198 (PIMS#)<br>74005 (Atlas ID)   | GEF financing:                         | US\$ 700,200                         |                                     |
| Country:                 | Tajikistan   | IA/EA own:                             | US\$ 250,000                         |                                     |
| Region:                  | Europe and Central Asia  | Government:                            | US\$ 500,000 (in kind)               |                                     |
| Focal Area:              | Climate change   | Other:                                 |                                      |                                     |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  | Mainstreaming sustainable and equitable trends of environment and energy   | Total co-financing:                    |                                      |                                     |
| Executing Agency:        | UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan  | Total Project Cost:                    | US\$ 1,450,200                       |                                     |
| Other Partners involved: | The Committee on Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center of the Republic of Tajikistan | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |                                      | October 1, 2014                     |
|                          |  | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed: September, 2017            | Actual: September, 2017             |

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

#### ***Project description***

In 2005, Tajikistan completed its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) in order to identify the priority cross-cutting capacity development needs of the country to meet and sustain obligations under the three Rio Conventions. One top priority identified in the NCSA was the need to strengthen environmental learning and stakeholder involvement in order to mobilize all sectors on Rio Convention themes. This priority cross-cutting need was the objective of an earlier cross-cutting capacity development (CCCD) project implemented in 2012. Another top priority was to strengthen the environmental management information system to facilitate more informed decision-making to meet Rio Convention obligations. This strengthened information system would serve to

inform decision-making across sectors on environmental priorities and create synergies and partnerships that aid achievement of Rio Conventions obligations.

Tajikistan has made significant progress in strengthening its environmental policy and programming framework since the completion of its NCSA. The country has adopted 13 laws and bylaws pertaining to environmental protection and has taken important steps to integrate global environmental obligations within its national developmental strategies. For example, the Third Poverty Reduction Strategy identifies the need for climate change adaptation activities at the sectoral level. Another example is found in the 2013–2015 Living Standard Improvement Strategy which gives individual ministries a basis for carrying out high-priority actions on environmental issues.

The project was strategic in that it responds to a targeted set of underlying barriers to environmental management towards the goal of meeting and sustaining global environmental outcomes. Specifically, the project catalyzed cooperation and coordination that has previously been limited by narrow institutional mandates and obsolete methods of analysis and decision-making. This project facilitated new partnerships between policy and decision-makers across environmental focal areas and socio-economic sectors while actively engaging other key non-governmental stakeholders. This project was innovative and transformative in that environmental and resource management at the sub-national level lacks institutional authority in the baseline. The strategic value of the project lies in developing technical capacities on how to structure and implement policy interventions that better respond to Rio Convention obligations.

The UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan was the implementing agency for this project and key partners for project implementation are CEP GRT and NBBC. Project was developed in accordance with agreed policies and procedures between the UNDP and the Government of Tajikistan. In line with GEF rules and procedures, UNDP established the necessary planning and management mechanisms and facilitated government decision-making. To catalyze implementation of project activities and timely delivery of project outputs NBBC was assigned as one of the key project partners. The project was designed to be complementary to other related projects under implementation in Tajikistan, including those supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Given the number of ongoing projects in the country, careful attention was given to coordinating project activities in such a way that activities are mutually supportive and opportunities capitalized to realize synergies and cost-effectiveness.

This project conforms to Programme Framework CD-5 of the GEF-5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Strategy, which calls for the strengthening of capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. Through a learn-by-doing and adaptive collaborative management approach, the project strengthened targeted institutional and technical capacities to generate information for improved monitoring of global environmental trends and thus enable more informed decisions on policy interventions. The project contributed to the development of capacities to implement and manage global environmental guidelines.

The project was consistent with the programmatic objectives of the three GEF thematic focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation, the achievement and sustainability of which is dependent on the critical development of capacities (individual, organizational and systemic). This project was also consistent with Tajikistan's United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2010-2015, and responded directly to Output 2.3: There is a more sustainable management of the environment, energy and natural resources. The project was also well-aligned with Tajikistan's programme for implementing the Millennium Development Goals, particularly MDG7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability.

### ***Description of responsibilities***

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved.

The key product expected from the terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report written in English that should follow the requirements indicated in Annex F. The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The report, together with its annexes, will be submitted in electronic format in both, MS Word and pdf format.

The review will take place in the consultant's home office with one mission to Dushanbe, Tajikistan, with approx. 5 days in-country mission in total. The consultant should submit a request with all the meetings planned during the mission at least 7 working days prior to undertaking the mission.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has been developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Dushanbe, Tajikistan. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: The Committee on Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center of the Republic of Tajikistan.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, project budget revisions, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The consultant is expected to use personal and phone interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. The consultant can also make use of written questionnaires, which could be distributed to the project partners and stakeholders with the assistance of the project team. In addition, the consultant can use other data collection methods and evaluation methods in order to assess the project.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

| Evaluation Ratings:            |        |  |        |
|--------------------------------|--------|--|--------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation   | rating | 2. IA & EA Execution                                 | rating |
| M&E design at entry            |        | Quality of UNDP Implementation - Implementing Agency |        |
| M&E Plan Implementation        |        | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency              |        |
| Overall quality of M&E         |        | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution        |        |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes      | rating | 4. Sustainability                                    | rating |
| Relevance                      |        | Financial resources                                  |        |
| Effectiveness                  |        | Socio-political                                      |        |
| Efficiency                     |        | Institutional framework and governance               |        |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |        | Environmental  |        |
|                                |        | Overall likelihood of sustainability                 |        |

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

| Co-financing<br>(type/source) | UNDP own financing<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Government<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Partner Agency<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Total<br>(mill. US\$) |        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
|                               | Planned                            | Actual | Planned                    | Actual | Planned                        | Actual | Planned               | Actual |
| Grants                        | US\$<br>250,000                    |        |                            |        | US\$<br>700,200                |        | US\$<br>950,200       |        |
| Loans/Concessions             |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| • In-kind support             |                                    |        | US\$<br>500,000            |        |                                |        | US\$<br>500,000       |        |
| • Other                       |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| Totals                        | US\$<br>250,000                    |        | US\$<br>500,000            |        |                                |        | US\$<br>1,450,200     |        |

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programs. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include chapters providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. Special attention will be paid to the Lessons Learned section. This should provide recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- Exit strategy;
- post-project sustainability of the efforts both in terms of governance and in terms of environmental benefits;
- capacity building;
- project achievements and challenges;
- mobilization of stakeholders and participation of the civil society;
- key institutional, technical and legal barriers found during the implementation of the project, and recommendations to address them in the future.

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Tajikistan. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. Please note that the **financial proposal is all-inclusive** and will take into account all the expenses incurred by the consultant during the contract period. All travel arrangements must be done by the evaluator and all envisaged **travel costs** must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 15 working days over a period of approximately 12 weeks according to the following plan:

| Activity                       | Timing         | Completion Date   |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---|
| <b>Preparation</b>             | 3 days         | <i>1<sup>st</sup> week September 2017</i>                 |
| <b>Evaluation Mission</b>      | 5 working days | <i>2<sup>nd</sup> -4<sup>th</sup> week September 2017</i> |
| <b>Draft Evaluation Report</b> | 5 days         | <i>1<sup>st</sup> week October 2017</i>                   |
| <b>Final Report</b>            | 2 days         | <i>2<sup>nd</sup> week October 2017</i>                   |

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable               | Content  | Timing   | Responsibilities                           |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Inception Report</b>   | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO               |
| <b>Presentation</b>       | Initial Findings                                       | End of evaluation mission                            | To project management, UNDP CO             |
| <b>Draft Final Report</b> | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes       | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission             | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| <b>Final Report*</b>      | Revised report   | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft    | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.      |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See Annex H for an audit trail template.

The report shall be submitted and all further communication with UNDP regarding the implementation of this assignment should be addressed to:

Mr. Khurshed Kholov  
UNDP – Energy and Environment  
91/10 Shevchenko Street, Dushanbe, Tajikistan  
e-mail: khurshed.kholov@undp.org

### ***Responsibility for Expenses and their Reimbursement***

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows:

- First payment: 10% of the total contract upon submission of the inception report and its acceptance by the UNDP Project Manager.
- Second payment: 40% of the total contract upon submission of the draft Evaluation Report and its acceptance by UNDP Project Manager;
- Third/Final payment: 50% of the total contract upon submission and approval (by UNDP-CO, UNDP Project Manager, UNDP RTA) of the final Evaluation Report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION, COMPETENCES AND QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Prior experience with GEF financed projects will be considered as an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project-related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

Academic qualifications/Education:

- Advanced (Master or PhD) degree in Environmental Science or a related field.

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in the field of environment protection or a related field.
- Knowledge of or experience with UNDP and/or GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
- Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects.
- Proven experience in environmental monitoring and in the implementation of environmental monitoring policies.
- Excellent communication skills and experience in conducting structured interviews with a variety of stakeholders.
- Proven experience with environmental monitoring in Europe and/or Central Asia.

Language skills

- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Knowledge of Russian will be an advantage.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The payment schedule is described in the table below:

| %   | Milestone  |
|-----|--|
| 10% | At submission and approval of inception report   |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report                    |
| 50% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

## APPLICATION PROCESS

Individual consultants from the RBEC UNDP Climate Change Mitigation Roster will be contacted to submit their financial proposals.

- Financial Proposal - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office and on mission, travel – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs), using the following template.

|  | Nr. of units* | Units       | Rate / USD | Total / USD |
|--|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>Work in home office**</b>                 |               |             |            |             |
|  | 10            | person/days |            | 0           |
|  |               | person/days |            | 0           |
|  |               | person/days |            | 0           |
| <b>Work on mission**</b>                     |               |             |            |             |
| Mission to Dushanbe                          | 5             | person/days |            | 0           |
|  |               | person/days |            | 0           |
|  |               | person/days |            | 0           |
| <b>Sub-total fee</b>                         |               |             |            | <b>0</b>    |
| <b>Travel costs</b>                          |               |             |            |             |
| International travel to and from country/ies | 1             | mission     |            | 0           |
| DSA  |               | overnights  |            | 0           |
| Local travel                                 |               | destination |            | 0           |
| <b>Sub-total travel costs</b>                |               |             |            | <b>0</b>    |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                 |               |             |            | <b>0</b>    |

\* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

\*\* Add rows as needed

- The application should also contain a current and complete C.V. in English.

Please note that the **financial proposal is all-inclusive** and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged **travel costs** must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have **vaccinations**/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN **security directives** set forth under [dss.un.org](http://dss.un.org) .

**General Terms and conditions** as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fjs>

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.





# ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (AS REVISED FOLLOWING THE INCEPTION REPORT, 2015)

| Objective and Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline value  | Target End of Project  | Sources of verification   | Risks   |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Long-term goal:</b> To deliver global environmental benefits by having better capacities and tools to monitor and measure progress in meeting Rio Convention obligations |  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Objective:</b> To introduce a national integrated and coordinated environmental information management and monitoring system in Tajikistan                               | 1. Adequate national budget allocation to environmental monitoring | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A government budget of \$112,000 in 2014 was allocated to environmental monitoring.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A government budget of \$200,000 in 2017 is allocated to environmental monitoring.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National budget</li> <li>CEP financial reports</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of government commitment to increase the allocation of resources to environmental information management and monitoring (<b>Strategic</b>)</li> <li>Resistance to improve environmental monitoring from politically entrenched sectors that has traditionally governed Tajikistan (<b>Political</b>)</li> <li>The objective of the project might be too ambitious and the support from the project resources and the government resources may not be adequate to initiate the changes required by the project strategy (<b>Strategic</b>)</li> <li>Poor coordination among different ministries/divisions/agencies/stakeholders and shortage of technical capacity to produce better quality environmental information products (<b>Operational</b>)</li> </ul> |
|   | 2. Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating                | Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 3 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 6 of 12</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 4 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 3 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 2 of 6</li> </ul> (total score: 18/42) | Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 5 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 9 of 12</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 5 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 5 of 6</li> </ul> (total targeted score: 31/42) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mid-term and final evaluation reports</li> <li>Annual PIRs</li> <li>Capacity assessment reports</li> </ul> |   |
|   | 3. Quality of environmental monitoring reports and                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current reports are produced with limited data, weak analysis and weak</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports present adequate disaggregated data at regional and local</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEP reports</li> <li>Environmental reports such as the State of</li> </ul>                                 |   |

| Objective and Outcomes   | Indicator  | Baseline value  | Target End of Project   | Sources of verification  | Risks   |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
|  | communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions in Tajikistan   | trend analysis<br>▪ Existing reports do not respond to national and international requirements  | levels, are informative and present environmental trends over time  | Environment and Communications to the Conventions  |   |
| <b>Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks to enable a coordinated multi-agency environmental information management and monitoring system</b>  |  |   |   |  |   |
| <b>Output 1.1:</b> The integrated and coordinated environmental information management and monitoring system is supported by adequate Policies, Laws and Regulations<br><br><b>Output 1.2:</b> Relevant institutions involved in the integrated and coordinated environmental information management and monitoring system have the capacity to fulfil their mandate | 4. Adequate legislation and policies for environmental information management and monitoring developed, detailing the institutional set-up, mandates of institutions and coordination and reporting mechanisms | ▪ The current legislation contained in the relevant Laws and policies are not comprehensive enough for the implementation of an adequate national environmental monitoring system | ▪ The body of Laws includes a comprehensive framework for a national environmental information management and monitoring system responding to national and international information requirements | ▪ Body of Laws<br>▪ Official Journal<br>▪ Final evaluation report  | ▪ The government does not fulfil its international obligations; including those from the 3 Rio Conventions ( <b>Political</b> )<br>▪ New legislation and/or policies proposed by the project is not adopted by the Government and/or the Parliament ( <b>Political</b> )<br>▪ Despite proposing to improve the institutional set up for a better coordinated multi-agency information management and monitoring system, no institutional changes occur ( <b>Strategic</b> ) |
|  | 5. The environmental monitoring institutional set-up and capacities are adequate for monitoring the state of the environment and responding to   | ▪ Various institutions are currently mandated to monitor some environmental elements with no national coordination, duplication of some functions and                             | ▪ The institutional framework is simplified, the relevant organizations have clear mandates reflected in their statutes and the relevant institutions are well coordinated and capacitated for an | ▪ Statutes of relevant institutions<br>▪ Laws legislating government institutions involved in environmental monitoring<br>▪ PIRs | ▪ The institutional changes might not be followed by appropriate level of resources (HR and \$\$) to implement the changes ( <b>Operational</b> )<br>▪ The in-service training system for public servants might not be interested in integrating into its catalogue the training curricula developed with the   |

| Objective and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline value  | Target End of Project  | Sources of verification   | Risks   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Output 1.3:</b> Staff involved in the integrated and coordinated environmental information management and monitoring system have the capacity to fulfil their duties | international obligations of Tajikistan   | limited capacities  | adequate national environmental information management and monitoring system   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Final evaluation report</li></ul>   | support of the project ( <b>Operational</b> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Policy- and decision-makers are reluctant to participate in training supported by the project (<b>Operational</b>)</li></ul>  |
|   | 6. The in-service training programme for public servants include course(s) covering environmental information management and monitoring systems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The current in-service training programme for public administrators does not include any course on environmental information management and monitoring system</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The catalogue of in-service training programme include course(s) on environmental information management and monitoring system</li></ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Catalogue of in-service training programme</li><li>PIRs</li></ul>   |   |
|   | 7. Number of public servants trained by taking the course(s) on environmental information and monitoring systems                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>0</li></ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>200 Public Servants – including trainees from the regions and districts are trained in environmental information and monitoring systems using the new training programme</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Proceeding of courses delivered</li><li>PIRs</li><li>Project management reports</li></ul>                       |   |
| <b>Outcome 2: Upgraded environmental information management and monitoring standards, norms, indicators, procedures and IT architectures</b>                            |   |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Output 2.1:</b> An effective set of environmental monitoring indicators endorsed by the  | 8. Adequate environmental indicators approved and monitored   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the national and international</li></ul>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A set of environmental indicators is in place and responds to national and international environmental information</li></ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>List of official environmental indicators monitored by relevant institutions</li><li>Final Evaluation</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>New standards, norms and procedures are identified but might not be adopted by the Government (<b>Operational</b>)</li><li>New indicators are adopted but they require additional resources to be monitored; which might not be</li></ul> |

| Objective and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline value   | Target End of Project   | Sources of verification   | Risks  |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| government<br><b>Output 2.2:</b><br>Adequate standards, norms, procedures and architectures are used to monitor the environment | 9. Adequate national standards, norms, procedures for monitoring these environmental indicators are officially in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no unified set of standards, norms and procedures to collect data, conduct observations and make sampling</li> </ul>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate official standards, norms and procedures are in place and used by the relevant institutions</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of official Standards, Norms and Procedures</li> <li>Assessment reports</li> <li>Final evaluation report</li> </ul>     | available ( <b>Operational</b> )   |
| <b>Outcome 3: An institutionalized coordinated multi-agency environmental information management and monitoring system</b>      |   |  |   |   |  |
| <b>Output 3.1:</b><br>Updated environmental monitoring information used in several national reports                             | 10. Examples of environmental monitoring information being used in national reports and communications                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited use of environmental monitoring information in national reports and communications</li> </ul>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental monitoring information used in several reports and communications related to national development</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National reports and communications</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Final evaluation report</li> </ul>                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines (<b>Operational</b>)</li> <li>Planners, policy-makers and decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes towards the global environment (<b>Strategic</b>)</li> </ul> |
| <b>Output 3.2:</b><br>Global environmental indicators mainstreamed into select development plans, policies and strategies       | 11. Up-to-date environmental information readily available to decision makers   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited availability of environmental monitoring information; often due to documents being “classified” or “restricted”.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental monitoring information readily available to decision-makers and the public at large through government communications and public websites</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Websites</li> <li>Communication products</li> <li>National reports</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Final evaluation report</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient commitment at both national and provincial/district levels to integrate environmental information in development and sectoral strategies, programmes and plans (<b>Strategic</b>)</li> <li>Government barriers to make environmental information public (<b>Political</b>)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Output 3.3:</b><br>Environmental monitoring information readily updated  | 12. Examples of development plans, policies and strategies that   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited integration of environmental indicators and monitoring</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of development plans, policies and strategies that include global</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Select development plans, policies and strategies</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resistance from Senior Government Officers and Parliament to allocate more resources to environmental</li> </ul>  |

| Objective and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline value   | Target End of Project   | Sources of verification   | Risks  |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| and accessible by the public<br><b>Output 3.4:</b><br>Resources to sustain the national integrated and coordinated environmental information management and monitoring system are mobilized | include global environmental indicators   | information into development plans, policies and strategies  | environmental indicators and monitoring information   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Final evaluation report</li> </ul>   | information management and monitoring ( <i>Political</i> ) |
|   | 13. Examples of increased mobilization of government resources to monitor the environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited allocation of government resources to environmental monitoring</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of greater allocation of government resources to environmental information management and monitoring</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National budget</li> <li>Communications to decision-makers on environmental monitoring resource allocation</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Final evaluation report</li> </ul> |  |



## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

| Document                                    | Description   |
|---|---|
| Project document                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> </ul>  |
| Project reports                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception Report</li> <li>Implementing/Executing partner arrangements</li> <li>GEF Climate Change Mitigation tracking tool at baseline, mid-term, and at the terminal stages of the project</li> <li>Project budget and financial data</li> </ul>  |
| Technical documents produced by the project | <p>Terms of Reference and reports for the following contracts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ToR Chief Technical Advisor</li> <li>Project CTA Management notes (2015, 2016)</li> <li>ToR "Conduction of the capacity needs assessment within the UNDP/GEF project "Strengthening Capacity for an Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System in Tajikistan"</li> <li>Report by NGO (in Russian) based on conduction of the capacity needs assessment within the UNDP/GEF project "Strengthening Capacity for an Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System in Tajikistan"</li> <li>LoAs with NBBC (2015, 2016, 2017)</li> <li>NBBC reports within LoAs</li> <li>ToR "Design and Development of a Database and Environmental Monitoring System"</li> <li>Contractor reports</li> </ul> |
| Other relevant materials:                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering committee meeting minutes</li> <li>Annual work programs</li> <li>Project budget revisions</li> <li>Financial Audit Reports</li> <li>National and local strategic and legal documents</li> </ul> <p>List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted</p> <p>UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)</p> <p>UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)</p> <p>UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)</p> <p>GEF focal area strategic program objectives</p>   |

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be amended and fully completed by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an annex to the TE report.

| Evaluative Criteria Questions   | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|
| <b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b> |            |         |             |
| • Is the project relevant to Tajikistan's environmental policies?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • Is the project relevant to UNDP objectives in the country?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • Is the project addressing the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the city/country/region?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • Is the project internally consistent in its design?   | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>  |            |         |             |
| • Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • To what extent have the delivered outputs contributed to the achievement of the project's expected outcomes?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • How was risk managed during the project?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| • Which are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| • Which changes could have been made in project design to improve its effectiveness?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| • How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>  |            |         |             |
| • Was adaptive managed needed and used in order to ensure efficient use of resources?   | •          | •       | •           |



|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?  | • | • | • |
| • Were progress reports produced timely and in compliance to project reporting requirements?  | • | • | • |
| • Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?   | • | • | • |
| • Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?  | • | • | • |
| • Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?  | • | • | • |
| • Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders?  | • | • | • |
| • Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized?   | • | • | • |
| <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>        |   |   |   |
| • Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?  | • | • | • |
| • Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? Which ones?  | • | • | • |
| • Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)            | • | • | • |
| • Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated in the city or elsewhere in the country or region?  | • | • | • |
| • Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?   | • | • | • |
| • How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt within municipal practices in transport and other areas?   | • | • | • |
| <b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b> |   |   |   |
| • How likely is for the project to achieve its long-term goal?  | • | • | • |
| • Are stakeholders more aware about sustainable transport challenges and policies? Which ones?  | • | • | • |
| • What is the impact of the project in the citizens of Dushanbe in terms of awareness about sustainable transport?  | • | • | • |

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&amp;E, IA &amp; EA Execution</i></b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings<br/> 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings<br/> 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings<br/> 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings<br/> 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems<br/> 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p> | <p><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability<br/> 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks<br/> 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks<br/> 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p> | <p><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)<br/> 1. Not relevant (NR)</p> |
| <p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b><br/> Not Applicable (N/A)<br/> Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>   |   |   |

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> See Annex D for rating scales.

- Project Finance
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
  - Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - Relevance(\*)
  - Effectiveness (\*)
  - Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
  - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
  - Report Clearance Form
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

## ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on **(date)** from the Terminal Evaluation of **(project name)** (UNDP **PIMS #**)

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):*

| Author | # | Para No./<br>comment<br>location | Comment/Feedback on the draft TE<br>report | TE team response and<br>actions taken |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |
|        |   |                                  |  |                                       |