



Aid for Trade project in Central Asia, Phase III (2014-2018) Evaluation Report

Evaluation of project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, management, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues (gender and marginalized groups)

October 26, 2019

Gevorg Torosyan

Table of Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations.....	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	16
2. Methodology.....	17
Evaluation criteria and questions	18
Evaluation approach and data collection	19
Limitations of Methodology.....	21
3. Relevance	22
Project impact and outcome, UNDAFs and PRD.....	22
Method of delivery	24
Engagement of beneficiaries	24
4. Effectiveness	25
Outcome targets	25
Output targets.....	26
Attribution.....	27
5. Efficiency	28
Quantitative considerations	28
Qualitative considerations.....	30
6. Management.....	31
Strategic and operational management	31
Monitoring and evaluation	32
Planning new activities	34
7. Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups	35
8. Sustainability.....	37
Macro level	37
Meso level.....	38
Micro level	39
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	41
ANNEX 2: SOW, EVALUATION QUESTIONS, AND EVALUATION SUB-QUESTIONS	50
ANNEX 3: CHECKLIST QUESTIONS.....	54
ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE.....	59
ANNEX 5: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE – MGP & TSI	66
ANNEX 6: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE – SME.....	70
ANNEX 7: THE LIST OF PROSPECTIVE MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS	73
Annex 8: FINAL TRIP AGENDA	74
ANNEX 9: EVALUATION MATRIX	80
ANNEX 10: SURVEY RESULTS ON PROJECT RELEVANCE	91

List of acronyms and abbreviations

AFT or AFT project: Aid for Trade in Central Asia regional project – specifically referring to phase III of the project, if not referenced otherwise

APR: Annual Progress Report(s)

AWP: Annual Work Plan(s)

CDR: Combined Delivery Report

IRH: UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and the CIS

RRF: Results and Resources Framework

TSI: Trade Support Institution(s), including trade, industry, and business associations, private consulting firms, training and research centers, national export promotion agencies, and other quasi-public organizations and corporations operating under the auspices of central or local authorities¹

MGP: Main Government Partner(s), including main national government partners and local (sub-national) government partners of the AFT project

MYPR: Mid-year Progress Report(s)

OECD DAC: The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee

ProDoc: AFT Project Document

RPD: UNDP Regional Program Document for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, 2014-2017

UNDAF: UN Development Assistance Framework

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

¹ Such as Uztrade and UzAgroexport in Uzbekistan, Naryn Free Economic Zone in Kyrgyzstan, and Independent Agency for Strategic Research and Planning of the Agro-Industrial Complex in Tajikistan

Executive Summary

The Consultant conducted a final evaluation of Phase III of the regional Aid for Trade in Central Asia project of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), at the request of the UNDP Regional Center in Istanbul, Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS. AFT Phase III (further referred to as AFT) focused exclusively on former Soviet Union countries in Central Asia: Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. AFT had three components:

- Macro level component I, which focused on capacity development of government agencies involved in trade policy making,
- Meso level component II, which focused on capacity development of trade support institutions (TSIs) are better prepared to promote trade and sustainable agricultural practices,
- Micro level component III, which focused on SME-level sales and job creation capacity development in agricultural and other selected value chains.

The evaluation approach was guided by the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, the client (UNDP IRH), the project staff, the TOR, available resources, and the principles of human rights and gender equality. The Consultant employed the following methods to collect and analyze data, as well as to ensure triangulation of the various data sources: carrying out in-depth desk review of project documents and reports and other reports developed by development and government partners, reviewing and analysing the results of the survey conducted among project stakeholders by AFT staff based on questionnaire templates developed by the Consultant, conducting direct observations and recording information on-site, and conducting semi-structured interviews. The Consultant used both qualitative and quantitative methods of data gathering. To ensure the quality of evaluative process, the Consultant developed an evaluation matrix, which provided comprehensive and detailed outline of data sources, collection methods, and collection mechanisms for each evaluation question and sub-question.

AFT is a complex project with 10 major components – macro-, meso- and micro-level components operating in three countries, complemented with the regional component. The partner countries have different governance and public decision-making systems, which strongly impacts the institutional framework in which private sector enterprises operate. Given the diversity of activities undertaken by AFT, the referenced complex and varying institutional environments, and the limited scope of this evaluation, the Consultant focused on key activities under the referenced 10 components.

General conclusions

The intended outcome of AFT mirrored Outcome 1 of the UNDP Regional Programme Document for Europe and CIS (RPD), while most project interventions have been highly relevant

to activities contributing to this outcome as listed in RPD. In addition, the project outcome and component outcomes of AFT were rooted into country UNDAFs effective as of 2013-2014 – the period of Phase III ProDoc design. The project and component outcomes maintained their consistency with the updated country UNDAFs as well. Through the survey, the key Government counterparts and other beneficiaries in partner countries reported the economic and sectoral growth priorities defined by the Governments had a high level of relevance in AFT activities as well.

Overall, the project has been successful in delivering core overarching goals of the project – job creation and increase in sales/export. Thus, by the end of Phase III the project activities led to the creation of well over 4000 new jobs, including 2 264 new jobs in Tajikistan and 1 492 new jobs in Kyrgyzstan. The project also played a lynchpin role in supporting USD 560 million of export deals - the majority of which stem from the Uzbekistan output at over USD 300 million.

The project achieved commendable success in terms of achievement of country-level output targets in Uzbekistan (100 % of output targets achieved), Tajikistan (95.2 %), and Kyrgyzstan (83.3 %). Meanwhile, delivery and monitoring of the regional output was problematic given its results relied on a complex history of institutional linkages in the region that were exposed to high-level political decisions (particularly, in Uzbekistan) to limit cooperation between the countries in the region.

Beneficiaries did not report about major delays with regards to the initiation and implementation of activities delivered by AFT. In addition, the Consultant concluded that the project proactively engaged and coordinated planning and the implementation of activities with AFT stakeholders and donor community implementing partners. For example, the adoption of UNECE standards for fresh apricots an anticipated adoption of new UNECE standards for walnuts and dried apricots are critically important outcome of joint advocacy efforts implemented at the international level by national trade promotion agencies of partner countries, through the coordinated support delivered by AFT, Hilfswerk International and GIZ.

Overall, the Consultant estimated that project resources had been spent in an appropriate manner. The level of expenditures and execution of activities was low at the regional level, which reflects the challenges the project faced during the implementation of regional activities. The amount of funding underspent at the regional level was evenly utilized by respective country offices. Remarkably, the ratio of execution of activities is aligned with the expenditure ratio in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and at the regional level.

The Consultant noted that AFT maintained effective project coordination from the IRH, while in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan AFT has established an effective chain of command between the country project manager and the employees in regions. Given that more hierarchic operational structure in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan has proved to be effective, the Consultant concurred with

the AFT decision to utilize a comparable chain of command and harmonize the reporting structure in Kyrgyzstan with those in neighboring countries during AFT Phase IV - by strengthening the centralized project management function position in Bishkek.

AFT gender mainstreaming efforts focused on job creation for women and promotion of women entrepreneurs. In Kyrgyzstan AFT interventions, which strongly promoted gender opportunities, were built around delivery of training and outreach activities. In Tajikistan, AFT's gender mainstreaming activities were delivered, primarily, through the Business Challenge Fund, which developed a micro-finance product focused exclusively women. In these 2 countries AFT met and exceeded the initial targets for job creation – both in total number and percentage of jobs created for women. At the same time the Consultant note that in Uzbekistan gender mainstreaming efforts have not been monitored using the gender output indicators.

Recommendations

In order to build on the achievements of AFT Phase III and effectively implement follow-on activities the AFT team shall consider addressing the following recommendation.

Strategic approach and sustainability of activities

1. The complex strategic approach of project interventions delivered by AFT perhaps best resembles the cluster development methodological approaches - private sector and value chain development-driven with very strong links to the public sector and a variety of cluster organizations. The fact that AFT operates in three countries and has a regional component adds another level of complexity to the overall operational and technical structure of the project. To best address these challenges, AFT may consider gradually moving toward a less complex structure. AFT to focus primarily on activities that directly lead to job, sales and export generation (outcome-level targets in ProDoc) in partner enterprises in selected regions, and further complement these activities with a limited number of macro-level and meso-level interventions targeted at critical improvements in the business-enabling environment and the capacity of trade support institutions in partner countries.
2. To unlock the sales/export and job creation potential of local firms, including inclusive growth outcomes for women and youth, AFT may specifically focus on firm-level competitiveness enhancement activities in firms with strong export growth potential or in so called “anchor firms”.
3. The farmer cooperatives are viewed as being instrumental in boosting productivity in the agriculture sector by the Ministry of Agriculture of Kyrgyzstan, as well as by the AFT team in Kyrgyzstan. Based on on-site observations and the information collected during the interviews with government, quasi-governmental and private sector stakeholders, the

Consultant considers that sustainability of efforts in this direction is questionable, and accordingly, recommends the AFT team in Kyrgyzstan to directly work with partner SMEs, without using cooperatives as conduits for delivery of private sector development-focused activities.

4. The Consultant considers that AFT may further strengthen sustainability of project interventions at micro-level if the AFT team in all 3 countries will utilize more unified and disciplined approach to selecting partner firms. The Consultant considers that three core pillars for effective partnership between private sector enterprises and the AFT team are: (1) promote the evidence-driven initial agreements between the AFT and partner SMEs with a well-defined timeline for new hiring (new jobs created) before the AFT agrees to issue a grant or provide technical assistance to a partner SME; 2) promote cost-sharing arrangements with all partner SMEs, and (3) reinforce monitoring capacities to hold the partner SME accountable for their commitments regarding initially agreed job, sales and / or export generation targets.

evidence-driven, formalized plans, with a timeline for increased hiring. Initial selection criteria, for both value chain and beneficiary selection, relied heavily on input from stakeholders

Management

5. The team in Tajikistan may further consider establishing a permanent office in Sughd, which can be a precursor for intensifying the AFT efforts to promote regional economic cooperation and cross-border trade in Ferghana Valley.

Planning new activities

6. Even during the third and fourth year of implementation of AFT Phase III, the project has been guided strongly by the indicative activities outlined in the RRF in ProDoc. The Consultant recommends this approach be reconsidered to enable more flexibility during the annual work planning efforts. The project should have more flexibility in the face of the changing institutional environment, shifting needs of beneficiaries, evolving capacities of key government and private sector stakeholders, and accordingly, adjust the project tasks that can ensure the delivery of predefined outputs.
7. The Consultant recommends the project adopts a more traditional workplan format with a brief narrative and flow chart, outlining the start of the project task initiation and completion months, key milestones, and major deliverables or outputs. The project can potentially abandon the development of an “RRF Results” table, which misses the referenced important and conventional workplan components.

Monitoring and evaluation

8. While in general, the monitoring and evaluation system provided the UNDP staff with a comprehensive amount of data that allowed them to learn and adjust implementation accordingly, the Consultant noted that the table titled “RRF Targets”, does not provide information on data sources, data collection frequency, data analysis methods and data quality assessment process. This raises a question on confirming the veracity of listed output-level results, especially when AFT must rely on data provided by stakeholders or on government and donor organization sources. The project may also consider developing more robust metrics (particularly, in terms of setting specific and realistic targets) to measure the success of regional component².
9. Number of jobs created is a core output level indicator tracked by the AFT monitoring and evaluation team. To further scrutinize the job attribution and data collection processes, the Consultant recommends the AFT team to conduct more comprehensive “spot checks” at beneficiary firms in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. These checks may include better review of HR records (employment agreements, payroll records, timesheets) and on-site observations and interviews with employees.
10. The Consultant recommends the project to develop a comprehensive job attribution methodology, which will further clarify the linkages between the assistance provided by AFT and job creation in beneficiary firms. The project may consider developing a comprehensive questionnaire, which would allow the team to make an evidence-based judgment, whether the new jobs have been created thanks to the assistance of the AFT project.

Gender

11. The project shall embed indicators and respective targets into the monitoring tables to measure the success of gender mainstreaming activities in Uzbekistan.

² AFT Phase III has introduced since the beginning of 2018 an evidence source log, which has been integrated in the project’s progress report.

Резюме для руководства

По просьбе Регионального центра Программы развития Организации Объединенных Наций в Стамбуле, а также регионального бюро по странам Европы и СНГ, Консультант провел финальную оценку III-й Фазы проекта ПРООН «Поддержка внутрирегиональной Торговли в Центральной Азии». III-я Фаза проекта «Поддержки внутрирегиональной Торговли в Центральной Азии» (далее именуемого «ПТ») ориентирована исключительно на страны бывшего Советского Союза в Центральной Азии: Кыргызстан, Таджикистан и Узбекистан. Проект ПТ состоял из трех компонентов:

- Макроуровневый компонент I, который был направлен на развитие потенциала государственных учреждений, занимающихся разработкой торговой политики,
- Мезоуровневый компонент II, который был сосредоточен на развитии потенциала учреждений, оказывающих содействие торговле (УСТ), которые лучше подготовлены к продвижению торговли и устойчивых методов ведения сельского хозяйства,
- Микроуровневый компонент III, который был сосредоточен на развитии продаж и увеличении потенциала для создания рабочих мест на уровне малых и средних предприятий (МСП) в сельскохозяйственных и прочих цепочках создания стоимости, которым было отдано предпочтение.

Подход, примененный при оценке, основывался на Руководящих принципах оценки ПРООН, на руководстве, полученном от клиента (регионального центра ПРООН в Стамбуле) и сотрудников проекта, на техническом задании и имеющихся ресурсах, а также на принципах прав человека и гендерного равноправия. Консультант использовал следующие методы для сбора и анализа данных, а также для обеспечения триангуляции различных источников данных: проведение углубленного аналитического обзора проектной документации и отчетов по проекту, а также других отчетов, разработанных партнерами по развитию и государственными партнерами; изучение и анализ результатов опроса, проведенного среди заинтересованных сторон проекта сотрудниками ПТ на основе шаблонов вопросников, разработанных Консультантом; проведение прямых наблюдений и запись информации на месте, а также проведение полуструктурированных интервью. Консультант использовал как качественные, так и количественные методы сбора данных. Для обеспечения качества процесса оценки Консультант разработал оценочную матрицу, в которой содержались всесторонние и подробные сведения об источниках данных, методах и механизмах сбора, применяемых с целью проведения оценки для каждого вопроса и подвопроса.

ПТ - это сложный проект, осуществляемый в трех странах, с 10 основными компонентами - компонентами макро-, мезо- и микроуровня, дополненными региональным компонентом. Страны-партнеры имеют разные системы управления и принятия государственных решений, что сильно влияет на институциональную структуру, в которой функционируют предприятия частного сектора. Учитывая разнообразие видов деятельности, предпринимаемой ПТ, вышеназванные сложные и изменяющиеся институциональные условия, и ограниченный охват данной оценки, Консультант сосредоточил внимание на ключевых видах деятельности в рамках вышеуказанных 10 компонентов.

Общие выводы

Предполагаемые результаты ПТ отражают Результат 1 Регионального программного документа (РПД) ПРООН для стран Европы и СНГ, в то время как большинство мер по проекту были весьма актуальны для мероприятий, способствующих достижению этого результата, как указано в РПД. Кроме того, результаты проекта ПТ и итоги по компонентам были внедрены соответствующими странами в Рамочную программу Организации Объединенных Наций по оказанию Помощи в целях Развития (РПООНПР), вступившую в силу в 2013–2014 годах – в период разработки *ProDoc* в III-й Фазе. Результаты проекта и компонентов также соответствовали обновленным РПООНПР соответствующих стран. В ходе опроса ключевые партнеры в правительстве и другие бенефициары в странах-партнерах сообщили, что приоритеты экономического и отраслевого роста, определенные правительствами, также имеют высокую степень актуальности в мероприятиях ПТ.

В целом, проект был успешным в плане достижения основных целей проекта: в плане создания рабочих мест и увеличения объемов продаж/экспорта. Итак, к концу III-й Фазы проектная деятельность привела к созданию более 4 000 новых рабочих мест, включая 2 264 новых рабочих мест в Таджикистане и 1 492 новых рабочих мест в Кыргызстане. Проект также сыграл ключевую роль в поддержке экспортных сделок на общую сумму 560 миллионов долларов США, большинство из которых связано с объемом производства в Узбекистане - на сумму более 300 миллионов долларов США.

Проект заслуживает похвальной оценки с точки зрения достижения целевых показателей на национальном уровне в Узбекистане (100% целей достигнуты), Таджикистане (95,2%) и Кыргызстане (83,3%). Между тем, достижение и мониторинг региональных результатов были проблематичными, поскольку результаты зависели от сложной истории институциональных связей в регионе, были подвержены политическим решениям на высоком уровне (особенно в Узбекистане), имеющим цель ограничить сотрудничество между странами региона.

Бенефициары не сообщали о серьезных задержках в связи с началом и осуществлением мероприятий по ПТ. Кроме того, Консультант пришел к выводу, что проект активно вовлекал и координировал планирование и реализацию мероприятий с заинтересованными сторонами ПТ и партнерами по реализации проекта из сообщества доноров. Например, принятие стандартов Европейской экономической комиссии ООН касательно свежих абрикосов и ожидаемое принятие новых стандартов ЕЭК ООН касательно грецких орехов и кураги являются критически важным результатом совместных усилий по защите интересов, предпринимаемых на международном уровне национальными агентствами по содействию торговле стран-партнеров, посредством скоординированной поддержки, оказываемой ПТ, *Hilfswerk International* и *GIZ*.

По оценкам Консультанта, ресурсы проекта, в целом, были израсходованы надлежащим образом. Уровень расходов и выполнения мероприятий был низким на региональном уровне, что отражает те проблемы, с которыми столкнулся проект в ходе реализации региональных мероприятий. Объем финансирования, который не был израсходован на региональном уровне, был равномерно использован соответствующими страновыми офисами. Примечательно, что коэффициент выполнения мероприятий согласуется с коэффициентом расходов в Кыргызстане, Таджикистане, Узбекистане, а также на региональном уровне.

Консультант отметил, что в рамках ПТ поддерживалась эффективная координация проекта со стороны регионального центра в Стамбуле, в то время как в Таджикистане и Узбекистане для ПТ была установлена эффективная цепочка командования между руководителем проекта в стране и сотрудниками в регионах. Учитывая тот факт, что более иерархическая операционная структура в Узбекистане и Таджикистане оказалась эффективной, Консультант согласился с решением ПТ использовать сопоставимую систему командования и гармонизировать структуру отчетности в Кыргызстане со структурами отчетности в соседних странах на протяжении IV-й Фазы ПТ - путем усиления должности по централизованному управлению проектами в Бишкеке.

Усилия ПТ по обеспечению гендерного равноправия были сосредоточены на создании рабочих мест для женщин и продвижении женщин-предпринимателей. В Кыргызстане мероприятия в рамках ПТ, которые активно способствовали продвижению равных возможностей для женщин и мужчин, были построены вокруг проведения тренингов и аутрич-мероприятий (установление контактов, донесение информации, консультации). В Таджикистане деятельность ПТ по обеспечению гендерного баланса осуществлялась, главным образом, через Фонд «Бизнес челлендж», который разработал продукт для микрофинансирования, ориентированный исключительно на женщин. В этих двух странах проект ПТ достиг и превысил первоначальные цели по созданию рабочих мест - как по общему числу, так и по проценту рабочих мест, созданных для женщин. В то же время

Консультант отмечает, что в Узбекистане не был проведен мониторинг усилий по обеспечению гендерного баланса с использованием индикаторов результатов по гендерным вопросам.

Рекомендации

Для того, чтобы опираться на достижения III-й Фазы ПТ и эффективно осуществлять последующую деятельность, команда ПТ должна рассмотреть возможность применения следующей рекомендации.

Стратегический подход и стабильность мероприятий

12. Комплексный стратегический подход к проектным мероприятиям, осуществляемым ПТ, возможно, больше всего напоминает методологические подходы к развитию кластеров: развитие частного сектора и цепочки создания стоимости, основанное на очень прочных связях с государственным сектором и различными кластерными организациями. Тот факт, что ПТ работает в трех странах и имеет региональный компонент, добавляет еще один уровень сложности к общей операционной и технической структуре проекта. С целью наилучшего разрешения этих проблем, ПТ следует рассмотреть возможность постепенного перехода к менее сложной структуре. ПТ следует сосредоточиться в первую очередь на действиях, которые непосредственно приводят к созданию рабочих мест, увеличению продаж и экспорта (цели для достижения конечных результатов в *ProDoc*) на предприятиях-партнерах в выбранных регионах, а также продолжать дополнять эти действия ограниченным числом вмешательств на макроуровне и мезо-уровне, целью которых является кардинальное улучшение условий, благоприятных для бизнеса, и усиление потенциала учреждений, оказывающих содействие торговле в странах-партнерах.
13. Чтобы раскрыть потенциал местных фирм в плане продаж/экспорта и создания рабочих мест, включая инклюзивные результаты роста для женщин и молодежи, ПТ следует конкретно сосредоточиться на деятельности по повышению конкурентоспособности на уровне фирм, в фирмах с высоким потенциалом роста экспорта или в так называемых «якорных фирмах».
14. Министерство сельского хозяйства Кыргызстана, а также команда ПТ в Кыргызстане считают, что фермерские кооперативы способствуют повышению производительности в сельскохозяйственном секторе. На основании наблюдений на местах и информации, собранной во время интервью с заинтересованными сторонами, представляющими правительство, квази-правительство и частный сектор, Консультант ставит под вопрос стабильный эффект усилий в этом направлении и, соответственно, рекомендует

команде ПТ в Кыргызстане напрямую работать с партнерскими МСП: не используя кооперативы в качестве канала для осуществления деятельности, ориентированной на развитие частного сектора.

15. По мнению Консультанта, ПТ может еще более повысить устойчивость проектных мероприятий на микроуровне, если команда ПТ во всех 3-х странах будет использовать более унифицированный и дисциплинированный подход к выбору фирм-партнеров. Консультант считает, что тремя основными столпами эффективного партнерства между предприятиями частного сектора и командой ПТ являются: (1) продвижение первоначальных соглашений, основанных на фактических данных, между ПТ и партнерскими МСП - с четко определенными сроками для найма новых работников (создания новых рабочих мест) прежде, чем ПТ согласится выдать грант или предоставить техническую помощь партнерскому МСП; 2) продвижение соглашений о совместном финансировании со всеми партнерскими МСП и (3) укрепление потенциала для проведения мониторинга – с целью обеспечения подотчетности МСП-партнера и ответственности МСП за свои обязательства в отношении первоначально согласованных целей в плане рабочих мест, продаж и/или экспорта.

Основанные на фактических данных, формализованные планы с указанием сроков увеличения найма сотрудников. Первоначальные критерии отбора - как для цепочки создания стоимости, так и для выбора бенефициаров - в значительной степени зависели от сведений, предоставляемых заинтересованными сторонами.

Управление

16. Группа в Таджикистане может также рассмотреть возможность создания постоянного офиса в Согдийской области, что может стать предвестником активизации усилий ПТ по продвижению регионального экономического сотрудничества и трансграничной торговли в Ферганской долине.

Планирование новых видов деятельности

17. Даже в течение третьего и четвертого годов реализации III-й Фазы ПТ проект строго руководствовался ориентировочными действиями, изложенными в Структуре результатов и ресурсов (CRR) в *ProDoc*. Консультант рекомендует пересмотреть этот подход, чтобы обеспечить большую гибкость при ежегодном планировании работ. Проект должен обладать большей гибкостью в условиях меняющейся институциональной среды, меняющихся потребностей бенефициаров,

развивающегося потенциала ключевых заинтересованных сторон в государственном и частном секторах и, соответственно, корректировать задачи проекта таким образом, чтобы обеспечить достижение заранее определенных результатов.

18. Консультант рекомендует, чтобы для проекта был принят более традиционный формат плана работ с кратким описанием и блок-схемой, с указанием месяцев начала и завершения задач проекта, основных этапов, ожидаемых результатов и основных результатов на выходе. Проект может потенциально отказаться от разработки таблицы результатов в рамках CPP, в которой отсутствуют упомянутые выше важные и традиционные компоненты плана работ.

Мониторинг и оценка

19. Несмотря на то, что в целом система мониторинга и оценки предоставила сотрудникам ПРООН исчерпывающий объем данных, который позволил им изучить и соответствующим образом скорректировать реализацию, Консультант отмечает, что таблица, озаглавленная «Цели CPP», не предоставляет информацию об источниках данных, о частоте сбора данных, о методах анализа данных и процессе оценки качества данных. В связи с этим возникает вопрос о подтверждении достоверности перечисленных результатов на выходе, особенно когда проект ПТ должен полагаться на данные, предоставленные заинтересованными сторонами или на источники в правительстве и донорских организациях. Проектной группе, возможно, следует рассмотреть вопрос о разработке более надежных метрик (показателей) (в частности, с точки зрения постановки конкретных и реалистичных целей) для измерения успеха регионального компонента³.
20. Количество созданных рабочих мест является основным индикатором результатов на выходе, отслеживаемых группой мониторинга и оценки ПТ. Для дальнейшего изучения процессов атрибуции рабочих мест и сбора данных Консультант рекомендует команде ПТ проводить более комплексные «выборочные проверки» на предприятиях-бенефициарах в Таджикистане и Кыргызстане. Эти проверки могут включать более тщательный анализ кадровых документов (трудовых договоров, ведомостей заработной платы, расписаний), а также наблюдение на местах и собеседования с сотрудниками.
21. Консультант рекомендует команде проекта разработать комплексную методологию атрибуции рабочих мест, в которой будут дополнительно разъяснены связи между помощью, оказываемой ПТ, и созданием рабочих мест в фирмах-бенефициарах. Сотрудникам проекта, возможно, следует подумать о разработке комплексного

³ В III-й Фазе ПТ, с начала 2018 года, был введен журнал источников доказательств, который был включен в отчет о ходе реализации проекта.

вопросника, который позволил бы команде сделать вывод, на основании доказательств, о том, были ли новые рабочие места созданы благодаря содействию проекта ПТ.

Гендерные аспекты

22. Проект должен включать индикаторы и соответствующие цели в таблицы мониторинга для измерения успеха мероприятий по обеспечению гендерного баланса в Узбекистане.

1. Introduction

AFT Phase III (2014-2018) was built on the results and lessons learned in Phases I and II of the project, and focused exclusively on former Soviet Union countries in Central Asia: Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. AFT Phase III had three components:

- Macro level component I focuses on capacity development of government agencies involved in trade policy making to ensure they are well prepared to streamline trade promotion environment, formulate trade related policy documents, and adjust to international trade agreements.
- Meso level component II focuses on capacity development of trade support institutions to ensure that national export promotion agencies; quasi-public organizations; and corporations operating under the auspices of central or local authorities, industry / trade / business associations, business development service providers, and research and extension service providers are better prepared to promote trade and sustainable agricultural practices, as well as to promote international trading and effective business enabling environment.
- Micro level component III focuses on sales promotion and job creation through improved production, management, marketing, and export capacities of SME, as well as increased productivity within selected value chains.

Respective component outcomes were framed in line with the component level rationalization and priorities outlined above⁴. Meanwhile, output indicators and targets were embedded into RRF. As opposed to outcomes, outputs (including respective indicators and targets) were not designed for the project components. Rather, they were designed based on the geographical coverage and focus of the project. As a result, intended outputs were categorized into four major categories:

- regional level output: on regional level in Central Asia, trade policy makers are better equipped for dealing with regional trade issues; national export promotion agencies are cooperating regionally on regional exchange visits and coordinated marketing
- Kyrgyzstan country output: In Kyrgyzstan trade-related policy makers are better equipped to support favorable pro-poor trade promotion environment, local authorities, selected

⁴ The outcome level target indicator for component I (macro) was meant to evaluate the positive impact on business performance due to the reduction of trade barriers, as reported in annual questionnaires by at least 25% of partner SMEs. The respective indicator for component II (meso) was designed to evaluate the increase in wage bills (at least at 5% rate) at more than 100 serviced SME and cooperatives per country, thanks to the services provided by partner TSIs. The component III (micro) outcome level indicator was designed with multiple targets in anticipation that 80% of supported SMEs and cooperatives would have an overall 20% higher wage bill, reach at least 5% higher sales volume, and create at least 200 additional decent jobs (of which at least 30% are for women) one year after receiving support.

business association and service providers are enhanced in their capacity to promote pro-poor trade, and the agriculture and agro-processing in selected value chains increased its productivity and exports volume

- Tajikistan country output: In Tajikistan, trade policy documents developed and adjusted to international trade agreements, trade promotion institutes and stakeholders strengthened in international trading and promoting sound business environment, selected agricultural value chains are based on sustainable use of natural resources, and supported information technology applied to improve business links and innovative economic activities
- Uzbekistan country output: In Uzbekistan trade policy makers are better equipped on easing trade with neighboring countries, research and extension service providers are enabled to promote innovative trade approaches and sustainable agricultural agro-processing practices in Central Asia

Several indicators were assigned to measure each output. During project implementation, some output level indicators and respective targets have been revised or removed and replaced (particularly those measuring the regional level output). These changes were approved by the Project Board.

The project activities under Phase III ended in August 2018 in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Meanwhile, in order to enable completion of the Trade Platform and depletion of funds⁵ the project was extended until 31st December 2019 in Uzbekistan and at the regional level.

2. Methodology

The Consultant conducted a final evaluation of Phase III of the regional Aid for Trade in Central Asia (AFT) project of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), at the request of the UNDP Regional Center in Istanbul, Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS and per the requirements of Terms of Reference presented in Annex 1. The consultant participated in a field mission to Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan from 13-29 May 2019, which included visits to:

- Dushanbe, as well as Khatlon and Sughd regions in Tajikistan from May 13-16, 2019, accompanied by AFT Project Specialist Ms. Gulsara Mamadjonova and AFT Trade Policy Specialist Mr. Parviz Rashidov
- Tashkent, as well as Namangan and Andijan regions in Uzbekistan from May 17-23, 2019, accompanied by AFT Project Manager Mr. Dilshod Akbarov and AFT Task Manager Mr. Kamoliddin Nuritdinov
- Bishkek and Osh region in Kyrgyzstan from May 23-29, 2019, accompanied by AFT Project Coordinator Mr. Urmat Takirov and AFT Project Specialist Mr. Mirlan Alisher Uulu

⁵ MYPR 2018, page 15

Evaluation criteria and questions

OECD DAC criteria (also adopted by UNDP) of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability were used to design the evaluation criteria. Per the requirements of the TOR, the criteria were further broadened to include management and cross-cutting issues (gender and marginalized groups) and detailed as follows:

- **Relevance**, in terms of country economic development priorities and national sector development priorities, as well as securing the intended impacts;
- **Effectiveness**, by measuring project results (outputs and outcome) and attributing observed changes towards the project;
- **Efficiency**, by assessing whether the project implementation strategy and execution were efficient and cost-effective;
- **Management**, by assessing how successful project strategic management, planning, monitoring and evaluation, and outreach activities have been;
- **Sustainability**, by evaluating whether the benefits that resulted from the project activities can be continued through adequate ownership and the implementation capacity of AFT stakeholders;
- **Cross-cutting issues:**
 - **Gender**, by identifying to what extent the project activities has contributed to gender equality;
 - **Marginalized groups**, by assessing whether people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project; and

The guiding questions within the framework of the referenced evaluation criterions is presented in table below.

Table 1: Evaluation questions

RELEVANCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Has the project strategy been relevant and appropriate to ensure the intended results?2. Has the project concept been in line with the national strategic and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries?
------------------	---

	3. Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship? ⁶
EFFECTIVENESS	4. To what extent did the project achieve intended outcomes and outputs? 5. Can observed changes or progress be attributed to the project?
EFFICIENCY	6. Has the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
MANAGEMENT	7. How successful have project strategic management, planning, monitoring and evaluation, and outreach activities been?
SUSTAINABILITY	8. Will the benefits that resulted from the project activities continue through adequate ownership and the implementation capacity of AFT stakeholders?
CROSS-CUTTING: GENDER AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS	9. To what extent have the project activities contributed to gender equality? 10. Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?

In addition, the Consultant proposed set of evaluation sub-questions within the set of the referenced evaluation questions and the approved scope of work (see Annex 2). And finally, the Consultant prepared multiple checklist questions to guide the data collection for each evaluation question and its sub-questions (see Annex 3). The checklist questions ensure the accuracy of informational input and are correlated with the semi-structured interview questions, survey questions, and with the questions to be addressed during the review of project, government, and implementing partner-developed reports.

Evaluation approach and data collection

The evaluation approach was guided by the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, the client (UNDP IRH), the project staff, the TOR, available resources, and the principles of human rights and gender equality. The Consultant employed the following methods to collect and analyze data, as well as to ensure triangulation of the various data sources:

⁶ “The overall goal (impact) of the project is: ‘By 2017, supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship’”, ProDoc, page 6

- Carrying out in-depth desk review of project documents and reports (including ProDoc, APR, MYPR, APRF, AWP, CDR), UNDP country and regional reports (including UNDAF and PRD), government-approved macroeconomic/sectoral development strategies, and reports developed by development partners;
- Reviewing and analysing the results of the survey conducted among project stakeholders by AFT staff based on questionnaire templates developed by the Consultant (see Annexes 5 and 6), and validating the key finding of the survey against the observation notes developed during on-site visits and against the result of semi-structured interviews;
- Conducting direct observations (especially through visits carried out to partner SME-owned facilities in the regions) and recording accurate information on-site; and
- Conducting semi-structured interviews, based on interview templates developed for each major stakeholder group (MGP, TSIs, and SMEs) and UNDP (see Annex 4), and then reviewing, structuring, and analyzing the interview results.

The Consultant used both qualitative and quantitative methods of data gathering. The quantitative approach comprised tracking project performance evaluation/assessment, monitoring results and other measures of effectiveness/efficiency/impact from progress reports, combined delivery reports, annual workplans, and other relevant documents/reports. In addition, budgets and budget revisions were used to assess the cost effectiveness of resource allocation/utilization. The qualitative approach included key informant interviews and the completion of questionnaires.

The Consultant paid a special attention to the selection of key informants who were interviewed. The key informants were private sector representatives, government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of industry organizations/unions, civil society organizations, local consulting firms, and other partners/beneficiaries/stakeholder Meetings and the appropriate participants had been selected, as per requisites agreed upon during the project inception stage (see Annex 7). As a result, over 50 one-on-one semi-structured interviews and over 10 group interviews were conducted with private sector representatives, government counterparts, donor community members, trade support institutions (TSI), civil society organizations, and other partners and beneficiaries. The Consultant directly observed and recorded on-site information, visiting over 20 partner SME-owned or TSI-owned facilities. The final visit agenda can be found in Annex 8.

The information garnered through interviews was categorized in accordance with the key evaluation questions and sub-questions, and qualitative data analysis was facilitated by organizing and tabulating responses to the interview questions.

The Consultant rendered objective observations while visiting project sites (primarily private sector beneficiaries) and utilized other data collation mechanisms referenced above to

understand the extent of the project impact and the degree to which the activities have been sustainable. Over the course of the evaluation, the Consultant conducted at least 5 site visits in each country for unstructured observation purposes during the evaluation.

To assess the project's impact on women and marginalized populations, the Consultant developed a set of strategic, yet streamlined, evaluation questions and sub-questions. In addition, the Consultant ensured that both the evaluation criteria/questions and data collection methods/sources (including the predetermined templates for semi-structured interviews and the survey questionnaire) were designed in a way that ensures that gender-relevant data would be collected.

To ensure the quality of evaluative process (including findings, coverage, and scope), the Consultant developed an evaluation matrix (see Annex 9). This matrix provides comprehensive and detailed outline of data sources, collection methods, and collection mechanisms for each evaluation question and sub-question. In addition, the evaluation matrix outlines success standards (indicators) for the evaluation questions.

Limitations of Methodology

AFT is a complex project with 10 major components – macro-, meso- and micro-level components operating in three countries, complemented with the regional component. The partner countries have different governance and public decision-making systems, which strongly impacts the institutional framework in which private sector enterprises operate. Given the diversity of activities undertaken by AFT, the referenced complex and varying institutional environments, and the limited scope of this evaluation, the Consultant focused on key activities under the referenced 10 components.

Despite the limited time for data collection, the Consultant was able to interview a major contingency of key beneficiaries. The Consultant visited capital cities in three partner countries, where he primarily met macro- and meso-level counterparts. The Consultant was also able to visit nearly all regions in the partner countries, where the vast majority of beneficiary enterprises operate: the cities of Osh, Uzgen, Nookat and the Karasuu district in the Osh region of Kyrgyzstan; the cities of Namangan and Andijan, as well as the Chust and Turakurgan districts in the Namangan region in Uzbekistan; the cities of Khujand and Isfara in the Sughd region, as well as the Khalton region in Tajikistan. However, due to limited scope and short duration of the field trip, the Consultant did not travel to the Naryn region in Kyrgyzstan, or to distant project sites in Southern Tajikistan. The completed visits were focused on conducting interviews and included a limited verification component as time permitted.

The Consultant developed questionnaire templates that AFT staff have used to solicit feedback from project stakeholders, and the Consult relied on these survey findings for this report. Bias is

possible with this approach, including biases associated failure to recall facts, failure to identify potential candidates for interview, and with established relationships between interviewed beneficiaries and the AFT staff (to minimize this specific risk, the interviews were conducted by independent consultants). The Consultant attempted to address these shortcomings by cross-checking survey reports with the written records from semi-structured interviews conducted by the Consultant

3. Relevance

Project impact and outcome, UNDAFs and PRD

The overall goal (impact) of the project was designed in line with Finland's Development Policy, Priority 2: "By 2017, supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship"⁷. The project outcome derived from this goal mirrored Outcome 1 of the Regional Programme Document for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, 2014-2017 (RPD): "Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded"⁸. The main objectives of the third phase of the Aid for Trade project were as follows:

1. Trade policies that promote human development, particularly in terms of making best use of regional and global trade agreements, as well as best practices;
2. Support to SME-oriented business/ trade –support organizations to deliver effective services to businesses, ensuring that businesses have the support they need to grow;
3. Direct support to entrepreneurs and small businesses to improve their processing and/or export capacities. The project will support entrepreneurs/farmers through the introduction of new and/or greener technologies, as well as new production methods

The intended outcome of Phase III of the AFT project mirrors Outcome 1 of the Regional Programme Document (RPD): "Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded."⁹ Most project interventions have been highly relevant to activities contributing to this outcome as listed in the RPD¹⁰. In addition, the project outcome and component outcomes

⁷ ProDoc, page 49

⁸ RPD, page 6

⁹ ProDoc, page 27

¹⁰ PRD, page 6

"Contributing to this outcome, regional activities will:

(a) Support country-level efforts, with a focus on the region's low- and lower middle-income countries, to design and implement national and subnational development strategies, policies, plans and options that can generate sustainable growth and incomes...;

of Phase III of the AFT project were rooted into country UNDAFs effective as of 2013-2014 – the period of Phase III ProDoc design.¹¹ The project and component outcomes maintained their consistency with the updated country UNDAFs as well. Particularly, the referenced outcomes were in line with Outcome 2 of the 2016-2020 UNDAF for Tajikistan (“People in Tajikistan benefit from equitable and sustainable economic growth through decent and productive employment, stable energy supply, improved access to specialized knowledge and innovation and more favorable business environment especially for entrepreneurs and farmers.”) In Kyrgyzstan, the project aligned with UNDAF 2018-2022 Outcome 1 (“By 2022, inclusive and sustainable economic growth is increased through agricultural, industrial and rural development, decent work, improved livelihoods, food security and nutrition.”). The intervention approach scheduled for Uzbekistan has been in line with UNDAF 2016-2020 Outcome 1 (“By 2020, equitable and sustainable economic growth through productive employment, improvement of environment for business, entrepreneurship and innovations expanded for all.”), as well as with UNDAF 2016-2020 Outcome 7 (“By 2020, the quality of public administration is improved for equitable access to quality public services for all.”).

A major strategic outcome of the project by the end of Phase III was the creation of well over 4000 new jobs, including 2 264 new jobs in Tajikistan and 1 492 new jobs in Kyrgyzstan¹². The project also played a lynchpin role in supporting USD 560 million of export deals - the majority of which stem from the Uzbekistan output at over USD 300 million.

(b) Support inclusive regional economic cooperation processes by leveraging private sector expertise and resources and contributing to South-South and triangular cooperation ...;

(c) Support innovative approaches to integrated local development and area-based and cross-border interventions, and strengthen regional economic networks with a particular focus on groups at risk such as ... vulnerable households and border communities in Central Asia, improving livelihoods in rural areas and facilitating access to trade...”

¹¹ ProDoc, page T

“This project is line with...

- the 2012-2016 UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Kyrgyzstan Goal 2: ensuring economic development, reducing unemployment and enhancing international economic cooperation
- with the 2010-2015 UNDAF for Tajikistan Pillar 1: on poverty reduction and governance, which aims to jointly enhance good governance, as well as economic and social growth, in order to reduce poverty, unlock human potential, protect rights, and improve core public services.
- 2010-2015 UNDAF's for Uzbekistan Priority Area Priority Area 1 (economic well-being) outputs 1.1.1. ('government capacity at national and local levels strengthened to improve ... facilitation of trade'), and 1.2.1 ('entrepreneurs, farmers and the poor have improved income and job opportunities through microfinance, business advisory and support services for SME development').”

¹² Calculations for the jobs created are as follows: TJK: BCF 377 (217), AIMS 30(2), gender program 82 (72), trade points: 85(38), trade development program 345, trade capacity development program 372, FEZ 973. KGZ: VCs 267 (94), GF: 1 225 new jobs, 5 887 maintained. UZB: pilot projects 192 (143), export support 269 (100) Total figure: 4217 min 50% went to women (where data available).

Method of delivery

The complex strategic approach of project interventions delivered by AFT perhaps best resembles the cluster development methodological approaches - private sector and value chain development-driven (AFT micro-level interventions) with very strong links to the public sector (AFT macro-level interventions) and a variety of cluster organizations (TSIs in AFT's "jargon" or AFT meso-level interventions). A handful of activities under those components fall into five categories: (1) trade policy and regulation; (2) trade development; (3) economic infrastructure; (4) productive capacity; and (5) adjustment costs. The fact that AFT operates in three countries and has a regional component adds another level of complexity to the overall operational and technical structure of the project.

To best address these challenges, AFT may consider gradually moving toward a less complex structure. One option is for AFT to focus primarily on activities that directly lead to job, sales and export generation (outcome-level targets in ProDoc) in partner enterprises in selected regions, and further complement these activities with a limited number of macro-level and meso-level interventions targeted at critical improvements in the business-enabling environment and the capacity of trade support institutions in partner countries. Particularly, to unlock the sales/export and job creation potential of local firms, including inclusive growth outcomes for women and youth, AFT may specifically focus on firm-level competitiveness enhancement activities in firms with strong export growth potential or in so called "anchor firms". The private sector enterprises are best positioned to engage farmers, transportation / logistics services providers, retailers, quality control organizations and other trade support institutions to foster a stronger pro-poor value chain overall.

Under this scenario, AFT may consider delivering a robust set of competitiveness enhancement activities at the enterprise level (marketing, sales, and financial management capacities improvement; staff recruitment, retention and training; logistics and transportation optimization; quality control and international standard compliance; business process optimization and lean improvements, etc.), and complete those efforts with a strategic-yet-critical set of activities aimed at the business-enabling environment area in partner countries, which will particularly target wellbeing of vulnerable and marginalized population.

Engagement of beneficiaries

Through the survey, the key Government counterparts and other beneficiaries in partner countries reported the economic and sectoral growth priorities defined by the Governments had a high level of relevance (see Annex 10). Most survey beneficiaries also stated their support for the long-term objectives of the project: increased employment and entrepreneurship opportunities, including those for women. Analogous results are reflected in the briefing notes

from Stakeholder Consultations Meetings in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan and National Board Meetings in Uzbekistan. The beneficiaries interviewed by the Consultant also praised AFT's willingness to focus on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts and increase sales volumes, generating new jobs and higher wages, specifically, in SMEs operating in the regions. Per most interviewed stakeholders, the referenced implementation approach matches the country priorities.

Both the survey results and Consultant's interview notes indicate that many beneficiaries, most importantly senior Government counterparts, indicated that the project established and maintained effective channels of communication with beneficiaries. Most notably, most beneficiaries indicated that the perspectives of their own agencies (Government agencies, industry/business associations, and other stakeholders) were adequately considered during the project design and implementation process (see Annex 10).

4. Effectiveness

Outcome targets

In late 2013, ProDoc linked the overall goal (impact) of the project with Finland's Development Policy, Priority 2¹³, while the project outcome was derived from Outcome 1 of the AFT RPD. Outcome 1 from the AFT RPD was embedded into the final PRD, and as referenced above, the project outcome of AFT is in line with PRD. ProDoc also established component-level (macro, meso, micro) outcomes and respective indicators for AFT. As is the case with project outcomes, the intended component outcomes of Phase III were established in 2013, when RPD had not yet been finalized. The final and approved RPD did not contain outcome-level indicators, which could have been linked with the referenced component-level outcomes of AFT.

In general, the outcome-level targets and indicators of UNDP-funded projects are meant to measure the extent to which the initiative is in line with the UNDP mandate, the extent to which UNDP support is relevant to the achievement of the country's SDGs, and the extent to which UNDP engagement is a reflection of strategic considerations, including the role of UNDP in a particular development context. Outcomes are actual or intended changes in development conditions, which country UNDAFs and respective Regional Program Documents are seeking to support. AFT is one of more than 30 projects implemented under RPD, which contributes to the achievement of outcomes referenced in regional and country programming documents.

As a result, interviewed IRH staff stated that the designation of referenced component outcomes and establishment of target indicators for AFT went beyond RPD and country UNDAFs in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. For that reason, component outcomes and

¹³ ProDoc, page 6 – "By 2017, supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship"

respective indicators referenced in ProDoc were considered by AFT as indicative, rather than as hard targets, that the project can influence.

AFT target indicators for component outcomes are job creation, increase in wage bills, and increase in sales. IRH and AFT staff indicated that because multiple Government, UNDP and other donor-funded projects were supporting private sector growth and trade linkages in partner countries, it was challenging to establish the extent to which fulfillment of component outcomes have been attributable to the project's support. It was also difficult to establish "additionality" of AFT assistance. Specifically, it was impossible to establish a clear link between the assistance provided by AFT at macro and meso levels regarding the improved performance of beneficiary businesses and the creation of jobs, increase in wage bills, and increase in sales as a result of that enhanced performance.

The Consultant agreed with the referenced challenges and concurred with the AFT team's decision to disregard component-level outcome targets during monitoring and evaluation activities.

Output targets

All indicators included in the AFT RRF are output indicators. The table below summarizes the level of achievements of output targets as self-reported by the project monitoring and evaluation in APR 2018.

Table 2: RRF Targets¹⁴

	Regional	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan
Achieved / Completed	Not reported	10	20	9
Ongoing / Partly achieved		2	1	0
% of targets achieved		83.3 %	95.2 %	100 %

Between the three countries, Uzbekistan is the best performing in terms of achievement of output targets. The project achieved commendable success in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan as well. As of December 2018, two targets, which had not been achieved by AFT in Kyrgyzstan, were meant to measure the micro-level interventions¹⁵.

¹⁴ AFT APR 2018, pages 38-68

¹⁵ Indicator K.I.2.3 - Increased export volume at companies after having received information services (including female-headed companies); Indicator K.I.2.4 - Number of SMEs having participated at regional and international

Meanwhile, delivery and monitoring of the regional output was problematic given its results relied on a complex history of institutional linkages in the region that were exposed to high-level political decisions (particularly, in Uzbekistan) to limit cooperation between the countries in the region. As a result, in 2018, AFT exhaustively amended the expected regional output and the respective targets referenced in the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) in ProDoc. Even after these changes, the project achieved limited effectiveness in terms of delivery of regional outputs. This inevitably raises a question regarding the effectiveness and benefit of changes introduced in the RRF.

Attribution

Given the complex structure of the project and AFT's decision to disregard component-level outcome targets during monitoring and evaluation activities, the Consultant relied on survey responses from project stakeholders based on questionnaire templates developed by the Consultant to assess whether or not the delivery of outputs has led to outcome-level progress (see Table 3). In addition, the Consultant validated the key findings of the survey against the observation notes developed during on-site visits and the result of semi-structured interviews to assess whether the observed changes in partner organizations can be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project. The aim was to produce a credible attribution story within the limitations of the evaluation activity.

Table 3: To what extent do you attribute observed changes in your organization to the activities and interventions implemented by the project¹⁶?

	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan ¹⁷	Uzbekistan
Main Government Partner	To a great extent – 0 % Sufficiently – 100 % Very little – 0 % Not at all – 0 %	To a great extent – 25 % Sufficiently – 56 % Very little – 13 %	To a great extent – 0 % Sufficiently – 100 % Very little – 0 % Not at all – 0 %
Trade Support Institutions	To a great extent – 30 % Sufficiently – 50 %	Not at all – 0 %	To a great extent – 50 % Sufficiently – 50 %

exhibitions increased their export turnover in percentage; Indicator: K.I.3.2 – Percentage increase in sales at targeted clients in supported value chains, one year after having received support.

¹⁶ Results of the survey conducted among project stakeholders by AFT staff based on questionnaire templates developed by the Consultant

¹⁷ The survey results in Tajikistan provide summarized funding for MPGs and TSIs.

	Very little – 10 % Not at all – 0 %		Very little – 0 % Not at all – 0 %
Beneficiary SMEs	To a great extent – 33 % Sufficiently – 47 % Very little – 10 % Not at all – 0 %	To a great extent – 24 % Sufficiently – 61 % Very little – 10 % Not at all – 4 %	To a great extent – 43 % Sufficiently – 50 % Very little – 6 % Not at all – %

Over 80 % of survey participants in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, and over 90 % of survey participants in Uzbekistan indicated that the changes in their organizations were to a great extent or sufficiently attributable to the activities and interventions implemented by the project. The survey results reflected the feedback from all major groups of project beneficiaries – MGPs, TSIs, and SMEs. Overall, most of interlocutors provided similar feedback to the Consultant during semi-structured interviews

5. Efficiency

Quantitative considerations

Overall, the Consultant estimated that project resources had been spent in an appropriate manner.

The total projected budget for phase III of the AFT project (2014-2018) was 9,032,000.00 Euro. In addition, the project holds unbudgeted roll-over of around of USD 259,334.74 from phase II. The project was co-financed by UNDP in the amount of USD 267,884.88 (so-called TRAC funding) and ITFC for the trade map conference in the amount of USD 75,460.03 In order to accommodate cash flow from the Government of Finland, the project was extended until the end of 2018.

Table 4: AFT projected budget in Euro (2014-2018), excluding underbudgeted roll-over amount, TRAC and expenditure for the trade map conference by ITFC

Year	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Annual budget	2,418,000.00	2,437,000.00	1,807,000.00	1,770,000.00	600,000.00	9,032,000
% of total	26.8 %	27.0%	20.0%	19.6 %	6.6 %	

Table 5: Overall expenditure per country in Euro (excluding underbudgeted roll-over amount, TRAC and expenditure for the trade map conference by IFTC)¹⁸

	Regional	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	Total
Budgeted in ProDoc	3,465,000	2,250,000	2,317,000	1,000,000	9,032,000
% from total as budgeted in ProDoc	38 %	25 %	26 %	11 %	
Spent 2014-2018	2,214,892	2,410,558	2,507,366	1,197,428	8,329,943
% from total actual expenditures in 2014-2018	27 %	29 %	30 %	14 %	

The level of expenditures (see Table 5) and execution of activities (see Table 6) was low at the regional level, which reflects the challenges the project faced during the implementation of regional activities resulting from the Government in Uzbekistan's approach in the past to limit engagement with neighboring countries. The amount of funding underspent at the regional level was evenly utilized by respective country offices. In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, the actual expenditure amount as a percent from that total expenditure was 4% higher than budgeted in ProDoc, and 3% higher in Uzbekistan. The project had to re-shuffle the budget due to delay in fund availability. 600,000 Euro were cut from the regional output at the end of 2015, to be added in 2018. In order to ensure absorption capacity this amount was distributed between the three countries. This was approved by the board in 2015.

In addition, the Consultant analyzed the activities delivered in the course of achievement of respective output and correlated those numbers with the budget expenditure ratio as of December 2018 (compared with the budget forecast from ProDoc). Remarkably, the ratio of execution of activities is aligned with the expenditure ratio in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and at the regional level (see Table 6). It is also worth noting that the project extended activities for the regional output and in Uzbekistan until 31st December 2019 to allow for completion of the Trade Platform and depletion of funds.

Table 6: RRF activities achieved / completed and the budget expenditure ratio ¹⁹

	Regional	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan
--	----------	------------	------------	------------

¹⁸ ProDoc, page 24 and AFT MYPR-Financial 2018, page 2

¹⁹ AFT APR 2018 and AFT APR-Financial 2018

Achieved / Completed	12	16	27	16
Ongoing / Partly achieved	2	1	0	0
% of activities completed	85.7 %	94.1 %	100 %	100 %
Expenditure ratio in %	76.4 %	98.8 %	100.1 %	100.7 %

Qualitative considerations

Some interviewed beneficiaries suggested that greater use of local experts can balance the high cost of hiring short-term international consultants. However, there was also a general recognition that AFT was effective in identifying competitive international talent, which fulfilled AFT's aspiration of meeting the expectations of beneficiaries in partner countries.

Beneficiaries did not report about major delays with regards to the initiation and implementation of activities delivered by AFT. The feedback that the Consultant recorded during the interviews is aligned with the more comprehensive survey results²⁰. However, concerns were expressed about the duration of tendering and awarding some of the grant-funded activities. The Consultant noted that the project followed the timelines and procedures outlined in grant manuals executed by UNDP country offices. In this respect, the project may consider raising the beneficiaries' awareness about the standard grant-making process and duration. Remarkably, the Grant Manual developed by the AFT project in Tajikistan has been well structured to the extent that the local UNDP office recommended other country projects to adopt and implement the referenced Grant Manuals. In Uzbekistan, the project elaborated 'The Provisions for selection of pilot projects under Aid for Trade Project' approved by UNDP Senior Management. The provisions are used by the project in the process of selecting market-oriented pilot projects and business ideas.

Overall, the Consultant concluded that the project proactively engaged and coordinated planning and the implementation of activities with AFT stakeholders. No major complaints were reported in this regard. The survey showed similar results. Donor community implementing partners also expressed satisfaction with the cooperation with AFT. For example, the partner donor representatives in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan stressed the ability of the AFT team to

²⁰ For example, in Tajikistan, 89 % of MGP beneficiaries reported that there had never been any delays with regards to the activities their organization was involved in, while 11 of MGP beneficiaries reported that the delays took place very rarely. In Uzbekistan, the response rate is 69 % (no delays) and 25 % (the delays took place very rarely).

establish effective channels of communication with a diverse set of stakeholders, ranging from senior Government officials to farmers in remote areas.

Multiple stakeholder pointed on the adoption of UNECE standards for fresh apricots and anticipated adoption of new UNECE standards for walnuts and dried apricots, as a critically important outcome of regional activities delivered by AFT. While UNECE's international commercial quality standards are adopted for the purpose of facilitating international trade, the existing standards do not reflect agro-climatic, geographical or nutritional specifications of agricultural produce grown in the Fergana Valley. The adoption of new standards will encourage high-quality production in the region and improve the profitability of local firms, while at the same time creating an internationally accepted framework for the protection of importer and consumer interests in foreign markets. This became possible thanks to the effective joint advocacy efforts implemented at the international level by national trade promotion agencies and other trade-related government authorities in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. The referenced efforts were initiated and supported through the diverse set of interventions (regional workshops, study visits, outreach / awareness raising campaigns) by the AFT team in close cooperation with Hilfswerk International in Central Asia (HWA) and GIZ.

6. Management

Strategic and operational management

AFT operates under a streamlined organizational structure – effective project coordination from the IRH, strong technical leadership in capital cities, and permanent presence in those regions, where several AFT partners are clustered (Osh, Naryn, Namangan, Sughd, Khatlon). In Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, the project has full-time employees stationed in the regional centers, while in Tajikistan project relies on short-term consultants to support the project activities in Sughd and Khatlon.

The Consultant noted that in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan AFT has established an effective chain of command between the country project manager and the employees in regions. The team in Tajikistan may further consider establishing a permanent office in Sughd²¹, which can be a precursor for intensifying the AFT efforts to promote regional economic cooperation and cross-border trade in Ferghana Valley. The UNDP has a Field Project office in Sughd. Presently, AFT is receiving technical and operation support from the UNDP field project office in Sughd.

In Kyrgyzstan AFT operational structure had to align to country office presence structure. As a result, AFT has employed more decentralized approach in project management until recently –

²¹ Presently, AFT employs a short-term consultant in Sughd, who effectively plays a role of the coordinator of the AFT activities in that city (especially those delivered at meso-level). According to the AFT team the consultant does not coordinate activities on a permanent basis.

by delegating added coordination and decision-making functions to regional coordinators in Osh and Naryn and by not creating a country project manager position in Bishkek. Given that more hierarchic operational structure in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan has proved to be effective, the Consultant concurred with the AFT decision to utilize a comparable chain of command and harmonize the reporting structure in Kyrgyzstan with those in neighboring countries during AFT Phase IV (less decentralized and with the country project manager). The recent situation with staff rotation in Kyrgyzstan – the regional coordinator positions both in Naryn and Osh were vacant in May 2019 – allowed to implement the referenced changes straightforwardly. Presently, the regional offices continue reporting to ARR. However, AFT was able to delegate more control on the macro and meso level to the AFT project coordinator in Bishkek through budget realignment.

Monitoring and evaluation

AFT component outcomes indicators and targets were framed in line with the component level rationalization and priorities outlined in ProDoc – macro, meso and micro level components. As discussed earlier in this report²², component outcomes and respective indicators referenced in ProDoc were considered by AFT as indicative, rather than as hard targets, that the project can influence.

Meanwhile, output indicators and targets were embedded into RRF. As opposed to outcomes, outputs were not designed for the project components. Rather, they were designed based on the geographical coverage and focus of the project. As a result, intended outputs were categorized into four major categories - regional level output, Kyrgyzstan country output, Tajikistan country output, Uzbekistan country output. Further, the project was able to embed macro, meso and micro level-related output indicators and targets into the referenced categories. The project collected data and analyzed the results of macro, meso and micro level interventions in each partner country, aligning the monitoring framework with the respective grouping of activities delivered in each specific country. As the project chose to focus on different set of activities in each partner country²³, and accordingly, defined the output indicators, in many cases the chosen output targets are distinct for each country.

Overall, the monitoring and evaluation system provided the UNDP staff with a comprehensive amount of data that allowed them to learn and adjust implementation accordingly. During project implementation, some output level indicators and targets have been revised or

²² See subchapter titled “Outcome targets”

²³ For example, in Tajikistan AFT heavily leveraged job creation and export generation activities through the Business Challenge Fund and grants directly issued to partner SME, while in Kyrgyzstan AFT very often relied on cooperatives and training / outreach activities to succeed in the same area (job creation and export generation).

removed and replaced (particularly those measuring the regional level output). These changes approved by the Project Board.

AFT paid extra attention to monitoring and evaluating the core output targets, which through data analyzes show the results the project achieved in terms of number jobs created²⁴, increased in production and/or sales²⁵ and increased export volumes²⁶. The referenced core output targets have been quantified and analyzed in all 3 countries, except that AFT did not assign an output indicator and target for several jobs created in Uzbekistan. The Consultant recommends fixing this gap.

AFT Annual Progress Reports and Mid-year Progress reports included a robust set of instruments for monitoring and evaluation the project results. In some cases, AFT has to rely on its own records to collect and analyze the data, including during the assessment of macro level outputs (such as number of trade policy papers decision makers, number of recommendation papers on improving regional trade and transport linkage, percentage of supported decision-makers self-assessing improved job qualification.), meso level outputs (such as number of Business Associations providing improved capacity on advocacy and providing services to members, number of Trade Promotion Centers established with improved capacity on providing services to clients), and some of micro level outputs (such as number of SMEs having participated at regional and international exhibitions, Number of clients of Export Promotion Agency reporting as benefiting from services provided). In general, the data provided by stakeholders, governments and donor organizations is also cross checked by Aft staff, in a certain instances by UNDP staff. At the same time, the Consultant noted that the table titled “RRF Targets”, does not provide information on data sources, data collection frequency, data analysis methods and data quality assessment process. This raises a question on confirming the veracity of listed output-level results, especially when AFT must rely on data provided by stakeholders or on government and donor organization sources.

Number of jobs created is a core output level indicator tracked by the AFT monitoring and evaluation team. AFT is using two-tiered process for verifying the numbers on new jobs created. First, beneficiaries are informing the AFT about the number of jobs created, as a result of direct assistance by the project. Second, AFT beneficiaries are sharing with the AFT details of new employee’s full name, hiring date, and contract type.

Presently, the AFT team to conducts periodic and random on-site observations at beneficiary firms. However, in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan no written documents are produced as result of these visits, no structured or semi-structured interviews are conducted with the employees. In

²⁴ Indicator K.I.3.4 and T.I.3.1.2 from RRF Targets in AFT APR 2018

²⁵ Indicator K.I.3.1, Indicator K.I.3.2, T.I.3.1.4 and Indicator U.I.3.2 from RRF Targets in AFT APR 2018

²⁶ Indicator K.I.2.3, Indicator K.I.2.4, Indicator T.I.2.7, Indicator T.I.3.1.5 and Indicator: U.I.2.3 from RRF Targets in AFT APR 2018

It would be also helpful, if in Kyrgyzstan and in Tajikistan more comprehensive review of HR records is conducted. To further scrutinize the job attribution and data collection processes, the Consultant recommends to make those “spot checks” in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan more comprehensive, by reviewing HR records (employment agreements, payroll records, timesheets) and conducting semi-structured interviews with employees.

In addition, the Consultant recommends the project to develop a comprehensive job attribution methodology, which will further clarify the linkages between the assistance provided by AFT and job creation in beneficiary firms. The project may consider developing a comprehensive questionnaire, which would allow the team to make an evidence-based judgment, whether the new jobs have been created thanks to the assistance of the AFT project.

The project may also consider developing more robust metrics (particularly, in terms of setting specific and realistic targets) to measure the success of regional component. This is important, because AFT has bigger chances to successfully implement activities at the regional level, as core public and private sector stakeholders in all 3 partner countries are willing to promote the enabling environment for such cooperation. And finally, the project may consider embedding into the monitoring tables (the table titled “RRF targets”) indicators and respective targets to measure the success of gender mainstreaming activities in Uzbekistan (See Chapter “Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups” for more details).

Planning new activities

The Consultant noted that the project adopted a very stringent approach toward planning annual activities. The project has been guided strongly by the indicative activities outlined in the RRF in ProDoc. Even during the third and fourth year of implementation of AFT Phase III, the project mostly followed the referenced activities, which were of an indicative nature and were outlined several years in advance. As noted above, the only exception was the regional component, which has been revised thoroughly by the project during in 2015.

The Consultant recommends this approach be reconsidered to enable more flexibility during the annual work planning efforts. The outputs and output targets can be left mostly unchanged. However, the project should have more flexibility in the face of the changing institutional environment, shifting needs of beneficiaries, evolving capacities of key government and private sector stakeholders, and accordingly, adjust the project tasks²⁷ that can ensure the delivery of predefined outputs. In addition, the Consultant recommends the project adopts a more traditional workplan format with a brief narrative and flow chart, outlining the start of the project task initiation and completion months, key milestones, and major deliverables or outputs. The table titled “RRF Results” in APRs and MYPRs, as well as the “Annual Project

²⁷ The project tasks are listed in column titled “Progress” of the table titled “RRF Results” in APRs and MYPRs.

Workplans and Budgets” are missing this information. The project can potentially abandon the development of an “RRF Results” table, and instead outline a workplan in the proposed format, reporting on both accomplished and planned tasks.

7. Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups

AFT gender mainstreaming efforts focused on job creation for women and promotion of women entrepreneurs. In Kyrgyzstan AFT interventions, which strongly promoted gender opportunities, were built around delivery of training and outreach activities (such as exhibition and trade fair participation) in cooperation with the Export Promotion Agency, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, other government stakeholders, TSIs and donor organizations²⁸, as well as in partnership with beneficiary cooperatives²⁹. In November AFT organized a conference dedicated to Women Entrepreneurship in Kyrgyzstan, which gathered over 200 women from Kyrgyzstan discussing current and potential businesses.

In Tajikistan, AFT’s gender mainstreaming activities were delivered, primarily, through the Business Challenge Fund (BCF), which developed a micro-finance product focused exclusively women. In addition, like Kyrgyzstan most of trade promotion-focused training and outreach activities delivered by AFT in Tajikistan promoted gender opportunities.

Both in Kyrgyzstan and in Tajikistan AFT utilized monitoring framework to align indicators with the referenced set of strategic interventions, which guaranteed that collected data would be utilized to measure the success of activities and the respective outputs³⁰. In addition, AFT paid extra attention to monitoring and evaluating the core output level indicators, which directly point on increased gender opportunities. Particularly, AFT tracked the number of jobs created for women and increased export volume in female headed companies as a result of AFT activities in these 2 countries. AFT has 2 big group of female beneficiaries – women employees

²⁸ The illustrative list of referenced training and outreach activities includes: Series of workshops in the framework of "Export Caravan" in 7 Oblasts of the country and Bishkek, Trainings on "Modern Tools of Market Analysis" in 7 Oblasts, Regulatory impact analysis training, Trade and Human Development training, Trainings for pilot Ayil okmotus in Osh Oblast on strategic plans development and integration of trade issues, Roundtables on food safety issues, Kyrgyz-Finnish Business Seminar, Forum of Beekeepers, International Exhibition in Cian, AgroExport Exhibition held in Osh, Workshop on the practices of export promotion for TSIs in Kyrgyzstan, Trainings on web-site development and e-commerce, Study visit to Estonia on the best practices of trade promotion and entrepreneurship support arranged, B2B meeting of food production companies with Kazakh and Russian trading companies, Training on exhibition management for CCI staff.

²⁹ A series of training sessions were delivered in cooperation with beneficiary cooperatives on management, marketing, Kaizen approach, HACCP compliance, financial literacy and other topics

³⁰ Indicator K.I.2.3 “Increased export volume at companies after having received information services (including female headed companies); Indicator K.I.3.3 “Female participation rate at the interventions supporting trade”; Indicator T.I.3.1.3 “Number of female headed enterprises supported by BCF”; Indicator T.I.3.1.5 “Percentage of export (changed to sales) volume increased at companies receiving BCF services (including female headed companies)”; Indicator T.I.3.2.2 “Number of additional (gender differentiated) subscribers stating to have benefitted from AIMS” from table titled “RRF targets” in AFT MYPR /APR 2018

and women entrepreneurs and managers (female headed companies). Thus, AFT tried to monitor and evaluate the success of activities targeting both referenced groups of beneficiaries.

It is noticeable that AFT met and exceeded the initial targets for job creation – both in total number and percentage of jobs created for women (see Table 7). Remarkably, AFT showed impressive results in Tajikistan where AFT created 291 jobs for women - almost 60 % of all new jobs created.

Table 7: Number of decent jobs created, including for women³¹

	Initial targets set in ProDoc	Total number of jobs created during 2014-2018	Number of jobs created for women	Percentage of jobs created for women (from total)
Tajikistan	At least 100 jobs created, 30% for female	489 ³²	291	60 %
Kyrgyzstan	At least 100 jobs created, 30% for female	276	94	34 %

Increased export volume in female headed companies, which received AFT support, is an essential output level target to measure the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming activities in female headed enterprises. While, AFT monitoring framework states that in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan all beneficiary SMEs (including female headed SMEs) reported increase in sales volumes by at least 10 % ³³, no disaggregation is available to measure increased export volumes, specifically, in female headed enterprises. This is something that AFT may consider updating in its monitoring framework.

By analyzing the project activity monitoring tables (the table titled “RRF targets” in AFP APR and MYPR), the Consultant noted that there was a fairly high level of gender considerations in AFT activities in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. At the same time the Consultant noted that while AFT MYPR 2018 states that in Uzbekistan the project focuses on sectors that have high levels of female employees, however, in this Central Asian country gender mainstreaming efforts have

³¹ Source: Indicator: K.I.3.4. and Indicator: T.I.3.1.2. from RRF Targets in AFT MYPR/APR 2018

³² “Finish methodology”, as referenced in AFT MYPR, page 42

³³ Source: Indicator: K.I.2.3. and Indicator: T.I.3.1.5. from RRF Targets in AFT APR 2018.

not been monitored using the gender output indicators³⁴, except that the AFT work plan³⁵ is referencing % percent of female participants in trainings provided by AFT to improve capacity of national export promotion agencies in partner countries.

On the regional level, the project has piloted a micro-narratives study with more than 1000 participants to identify perception on the barriers for women entrepreneurs, which further helped the project to develop dedicated activities for AFT phase IV³⁶. In addition, AFT promoted women participation in regional workshops and coordination meetings among CA countries on cross-border issues³⁷, as well as organized a regional conference dedicated to women entrepreneurs³⁸. The gender-disaggregated outputs associated with these activities were duly tracked through the AFT monitoring and evaluation framework.

AFT Phase III did not directly cover marginalized groups other than women from rural areas. However, AFT supported national trade and development policies and programs, in which poverty reduction through increased employment and wages was a key priority³⁹. At the same time, there was noticeable interest in AFT to develop a strategy for increased engagement in project activities of other marginalized groups.

8. Sustainability

Macro level

Long-term benefits have accrued to several key Governmental and quasi-Governmental (including TSI) beneficiaries in partner countries. For example, the AFT team in Kyrgyzstan succeeded in proactively and effectively engaging and establishing on-going cooperation with leading public sector change-makers from the central Government (such as the Investment Promotion and Protection Agency and the Guarantee Fund). As a result, the AFT team played a critical role in the initiation and implementation of a number of macro-level interventions (related public policy reform and institutional enhancement), including preparation of the charter documents of the JSC "Guarantee Fund" and its structure, The Program of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic on Export Development for 2019-2022. The Consultant noted that the project was also able to establish strong relationships with central Government

³⁴ See the table titled "RRF targets" in AFP APR and MYPR

³⁵ Table titled "RRF Results" in AFT APR and MYPR

³⁶ AFT MYPR 2018, page 14

³⁷ Such as the Regional workshop to enhance the connections among trade support institutions and capacity development on trade promotion, Regional workshop on findings for the regional Free Economic Zones study, Regional workshop on export promotion strategies for TSIs and business consultants jointly conducted with EBRD

³⁸ In 2017 AFT organization the regional conference "Connecting businesses: building a viable future for women entrepreneurs from Central Asia - Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan."

³⁹ ProDoc, page 16

institutions in Uzbekistan. Accordingly, a set of effective interventions were designed and delivered by the project at the macro-level in Uzbekistan. These allowed AFT to become a well-respected and long-standing interlocutor for key Government counterparts in these countries.

Until recently, the project in Tajikistan collaborated effectively with the main macro-level counterpart, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade. However, after the resignation of the first Deputy Minister of MEDT, Nazrizoda Saidrakhmon, the dialogue slowed down. To secure intended macro-level outputs in the long run, the project should intensify its efforts in this direction and reestablish effective channels of communication with the recently appointed Deputy Minister of Economy, Mr. Zavkizoda.

Meso level

The Consultant noted that the AFT team in Tajikistan has engaged several progressive regional TSIs, including LLC Rushd, the Association of Entrepreneurs of Sughd region (AESO), the Association of Agrobusiness of Tajikistan, and PO “Quality Management Center.” Meanwhile, the Consultant’s understanding was that the number of private sectors TSIs was lacking in Uzbekistan. As a result, the project targeted to establish sustainable partnership schemes with Chamber of Commerce and UzTrade. The situation in Kyrgyzstan is different, and the country has a very vibrant private-sector ecosystem. Therefore, the Consultant urges the AFT team in Kyrgyzstan to engage and, if needed, nourish private sector TSIs at the regional level (such as consulting firms and other private sector institutions that support the business ecosystem).

Although some of meso level interventions were clearly impactful, a legitimate question remains as to whether the project of restrained size and complexity will yield sustainable results if project targets to achieve its main goals (job creation, sales promotion) through intermediaries – TSI. The needs of partner SMEs are so vivid, intense and deep (production, marketing, logistics, quality control, sales, and export capacity development-related) that adding new intermediaries into AFT-SME linkages may not necessarily lead to higher efficiency and sustainability. In this regard, the Consultant noted that some of TSI representatives did not articulate clearly on to why the project should continue support enterprises through the respective intermediaries (TSI), as opposed to directly engaging with enterprises and, merely, using TSI as consulting, outreach, advocacy, and other type of resource supplies. This outlook is strengthened by the observations and interview notes collected by the Consultant in all three. In particular, the Consultant was not convinced about the sustainability of joint training and awareness-raising activities delivered with local community leaders in Sughd (Tajikistan) and the Chamber of Commerce in Tashkent and Namangan (Uzbekistan), and the establishment and operation of entrepreneurship centers in Osh and other regional centers in Kyrgyzstan in partnership with local authorities and municipalities.

Micro level

The Consultant concluded that majority of interviewed SME beneficiaries gained from cooperation with AFT, and the respective intervention led to permanent changes in adopting new technologies and identifying new customers. Many firms managed to secure buyers and other partners during and after AFT support. The project's ability to meet majority of output targets and reported creation of over 4000 jobs during the project lifetime (AFT Phase 3) reinforce on-site observations recorded by the Consultant.

Notably, the AFT team in Uzbekistan identified and supported several successful non-ag anchor firms, expanding the reach of the AFT project to other value chains with strong growth potential, such as the apparel, textile and footwear manufacturing value chains. The Consultant also noted that the AFT team in Tajikistan identified and engaged a number of successful anchor firms, which serve as a lynchpin in promoting the production and competitiveness of the entire value chain during and after AFT Phase 3 activities (Mevai tilloi LLC, the producer of HACCP-compliant fruit and vegetable boxes; IsfaraFood, the leading and one of the largest dried-food exporters in the Isfara region).

At the same time limited number beneficiaries expressed concerns that some enterprise level interventions were short-term in nature (limited to the procurement of equipment through grant-funding mechanisms). And this is reconfirmed by the Consultant's on-site observations. More continuous support for securing export contracts and buyer contracts in internal market might generate larger and sustainable sales/export results.

The farmer cooperatives are viewed as being instrumental in boosting productivity in the agriculture sector by the Ministry of Agriculture of Kyrgyzstan. Apparently, the AFT team in Kyrgyzstan followed this strategic approach and funneled a significant amount of project resources toward the strengthening of institutional and production capacities of selected partner agricultural cooperatives. However, several local TSI beneficiaries were skeptical about this strategic approach. Some of interviewed Government stakeholders expressing concerns for sustainability of efforts in this direction as well. And based on on-site observations, the Consultant tends to agree with the referenced skeptical opinion. It is worth to point that as of December 2018 two outputs targets, which had not been met by AFT in Kyrgyzstan were meant to measure the micro level interventions.

The Consultant considers that AFT may further strengthen sustainability of project interventions at micro-level if the AFT team in all 3 countries will utilize more unified and disciplined approach to selecting partner firms. The Consultant considers that three core pillars for effective partnership between private sector enterprises and the AFT team are:

- strengthen the evidence-based linkages between the AFT agreement to issue a grant or provide technical assistance with a partner SME commitment to increase in jobs, sales and / or export (based on initial observations, the Consultant considers that the team in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan showed solid progress under this pillar),
- promote cost-sharing arrangements with all partner SMEs (this pillar can be further strengthened in all 3 countries),
- reinforce monitoring capacities (particularly, in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan) to hold the partner SME accountable for their commitments regarding initially agreed job, sales and / or export generation targets.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultant for Project Evaluation of the Aid for Trade Project in Central Asia

Type of Contract: IC (Consultant)
Travel: ☐ no travel required
☒ travel required
Languages Required: ☐ Arabic ☒ English ☐ French
☒ Russian ☐ Spanish ☐ Chinese ☐ Portuguese
Duration: estimated from 04/03/2019 to 01/08/2019
Work input: app. 26 working days
Location: Home-based with travel to Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan

1. Background

UNDP works in more than 170 countries and territories, helping to achieve the eradication of poverty, and the reduction of inequalities and exclusion. UNDP supports countries to develop policies, leadership skills, partnering abilities, institutional capabilities and build resilience in order to sustain development results. The 'Wider Europe: Aid for Trade in Central Asia' is a regional project that supports countries in the region to harvest the benefits of trade for human development. The Aid for Trade project is part of the Regional Programme for Europe and the CIS (2014-2017) and has since its start in 2014 supported the creation of well over 1000 new jobs. Overall figures of users of the AFT project related activities total over 314 000.

Phase III (2014-2018) of the Aid for Trade project supports national trade and development policies and programs that prioritize employment and sustainable development in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan as focus countries.

The main **objectives** of the third phase of the Aid for Trade project are as follows:

1. Trade policies that promote human development, particularly in terms of making best use of regional and global trade agreements, as well as best practices (macro);
2. Support to SME-oriented business/ trade –support organizations to deliver effective services to businesses, ensuring that businesses have the support they need to grow (meso);
3. Direct support to entrepreneurs and small businesses to improve their processing and/or export capacities. The project will support entrepreneurs/farmers through the introduction of new and/or greener technologies, as well as new production methods (micro).

The project also promotes better cooperation between the different countries in the implementation and coordination of different thematic areas.

EVALUATION SCOPE: This evaluation is expected to evaluate the *Aid for Trade project in Central Asia (phase III)*. The evaluation will cover the full implementation period (2014-2018) of the project, all the countries covered, and the clients involved in the project.

EVALUATION PURPOSE: The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether the project has achieved its outputs as well as the intended impact and the overall quality of the implementation.

In addition, the project would like to derive lessons learned that will be essential for Phase 4 of the project. The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Project Board, relevant UNDP country offices and national stakeholders. Information specifically targeting the successes and failures of the project is especially sought after.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES: Assess the extent, to which the project achieved its overall objectives and outputs as identified in the project document and annual working plans:

- Review effectiveness of the overall project interventions, their main achievements, compliance with expanding countries' needs;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which project outputs have reached the intended clients, including to what extent the outputs have achieved its targets from a macro, meso and micro level as per objectives stated above;
- Assess the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outputs and benefits after completion of the project - analyze how far the system of exit policy in the project ensures the sustainability of the project benefits;
- Identify gaps/weaknesses in the project design and provide recommendations as to their improvement;
- Identify lessons learnt from projects interventions, as well as best practices both from project implementation as well a project management perspective.

2. Description of Responsibilities

The evaluation should determine the project's relevance, performance, results, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and substantiality, including lessons learned and recommendations:

Relevance

- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards the intended results;
- Review how the project addressed countries' priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?

Effectiveness: measures the manner in which the intended output targets were achieved. Measuring effectiveness involves an assessment of cause and effect in that how far can observable changes be attributed to project outputs. This includes the following steps:

- Measuring change in the observed output and outcome;
- Attributing observed changes or progress towards the project;
- Assessing the value of the change (positive and/or negative).
- How has the activities of the project contributed to gender equality?

Efficiency

- Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?

Sustainability: to measure to what extent the benefits of the outputs will continue after the project has ended. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating to what extent the capacity can be maintained.

Gender Equality

- Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?
- To what extent does the project contribute to UN_SWAP performance indicators?

Impact, especially from UNDP's perspective, measures the changes on human development that are caused by the project outputs, specifically for job creation, livelihoods improvements, sales/export increase and facilitating ease of business including capacity development, and access to more efficient and transparent business processes.

Evaluations in UNDP are guided by the principles of **human rights** and **gender equality**. As a result, when collecting data, evaluators need to ensure that women and disadvantaged groups are adequately represented.

The **Evaluation Consultant** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP. Specifically, the Evaluator will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology and approach;
- Conduct the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation;
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report;
- Finalize the evaluation report in English and submit it to UNDP.

Timeline and schedule (tentative)

The evaluation will commence in first quarter of 2019. The duration of the assignment is up to 26 working days including site visits and writing of the final report. It is expected that three countries are to be visited in person.

- Activity 1: Desk review of relevant reports, Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan
Estimated work input: 3 days
Location: Home- based
Responsible Party: International Consultant
- Activity 2: Initial briefing
Estimated work input: 1 day
Location: Home-based
Responsible Party: UNDP IRH, International consultant
- Activity 3: Consultations, meetings as well as in-person interviews related to the evaluation including relevant partners
Estimated work input: 14 days (Four days per country, 2 days for IRH & board (online))
Location: Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and home-based
Responsible Party:

- Activity 4: Preparation of draft evaluation report and recommendations
Estimated work input: 4 days
Location: Home based
Responsible Party: International consultant, UNDP
- Activity 5: Finalization of evaluation report and recommendations incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff, IRH and UNDP COs and submission of the final evaluation report
Estimated work input: 4 days
Location: Home based
Responsible Party: International consultant, UNDP

Deliverables

Deliverable 1 (by 26 April 2019)

- Evaluation inception report (prior to start of in-country evaluation mission)

Deliverable 2 (by 14 June 2019)

- In-country evaluation mission report, as well as online interview with IRH and the board. Consultant is not expected to travel or work during week 3+4, as during this time the project will collect survey data as per survey developed by the consultant, week 6 is for comments on the evaluation report

Deliverable 3: (by 21 June 2019)

- Draft evaluation report in line with the UNDP corporate standard that can be found in [annex 7 of](#) the UNDP evaluation guidance. Week 8 is time for UNDP to provide comments on the evaluation report

Deliverable 4 (by 28 June 2019)

- Final draft evaluation report with comments incorporated (structure of the report annex 1)

Payment schedule:

- Payment 1: 30% upon confirmation by the Certifying Officer of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 1
- Payment 2: 20% upon confirmation by the Certifying Officer of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 2
- Payment 3: 20% upon confirmation by the Certifying Officer of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 3
- Payment 4: 30% upon confirmation by the Certifying Officer of satisfactory delivery of Deliverable 4

3. Competencies

Corporate competencies:

- ☒ Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- ☒ Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- ☒ Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- ☒ Treats all people fairly without favoritism;

- ☒ Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment

Functional competencies:

- ☒ Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in a team
- ☒ Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
- ☒ Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
- ☒ Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities
- ☒ Excellent public speaking and presentation skills

Qualification Required:

Education:

Minimum Master's Degree in a subject related to socio-economic development

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of professional expertise in international development co-operation in programme/project management and impact assessment/evaluation;
- Minimum 6 years of experience in conducting evaluations including around UNDP thematic areas of rural development and productive capacities;
- Excellent professional knowledge of the CIS region, especially Central Asia, regarding local development or private sector development.

Language skills:

- Excellent writing, editing, and oral communication skills in English and Russian.

***Payments** will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*

*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*

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

Annex 1:

Executive summary (in English and Russian)

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation

- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with () should be rated^[1])*

Strategic

- Strategic focus of the project and its alignment to the UNDP Strategic Plan and the Finnish Government development priorities
- Cross SDG impact

Relevant

- Engagement of priority clients (rural population and private sector)
- Creation of opportunities for marginalised population
- Scale of the project and how it contributes to development change

Management & monitoring

- Country ownership
- Replication approach
- Cost-effectiveness
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements
- Monitoring

Efficient

-
- Attainment of objectives (rating)
- Attainment of targets (rating)
- Quality of impact (rating)
- Sustainability (rating)

Recommendations

- 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

^[1] The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

Methodology

In order to gather evidence to address the evaluation questions, the evaluation needs to:

- Assess existing documentation (mainly reports, AWP, RRFs, visibility materials, project briefs)-desk review;
- Use standardized questionnaires to obtain information from stakeholders;
- Conduct one to one interviews with selected stakeholders and project staff;
- Conduct on-site observation (field/project site visits) to record accurate information on-site;
- Conduct group or individual interviews;
- Make a presentation of, and discuss, interim findings and recommendations with UNDP team members in the country and in IRH (online);
- Formulate practical and helpful recommendations for the third phase of the project;

The structure of the methodology will be defined as per consultant's proposal. Data will be collected by UNDP AFT based on survey questionnaire developed by consultant prior to verification mission. The same survey will then also be distributed again to the project clients. The survey questionnaires should be reasonable in terms of data collected.

Sampling criteria: Activities that have more than 100 direct beneficiaries need to have a sample of at least 10% of the beneficiaries. This sample needs to consist of at least 50% women. In addition, indirect beneficiaries need to be consulted. Activities that have less than 100 direct beneficiaries need to have a sample of at least 20% of the beneficiaries. This sample needs to consist of at least 50% women. In addition, indirect beneficiaries need to be consulted.

In addition, samples should not only include community/association/government high-level representatives, but also ordinary beneficiaries.

In addition to targeting direct partners, the evaluation will also include project staff, country office staff, relevant government partners, private sector, and relevant development partners.

Evaluation ethics: Evaluations in UNDP are conducted in accordance with the principles outlines in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluation needs to be compliant to the standards set forth in these guidelines.

Annex II- List of Documents

#	Document	Year
1	Project Document	2013
2	Local Project Appraisal Committee Meeting	2013
3	Environmental and Social Screening Summary	2013
4	Combined Delivery Report	2014
5	Cost Sharing Agreement	2014
6	AWPS and Budget Revisions	2014
7	Final Programme Report	2014
8	Combined Delivery Report	2015
9	Progress Report	2015
10	AWPS and Budget Revisions	2015
11	Combined Delivery Report	2016
12	Progress Report	2016
13	AWPS and Budget Revisions	2016
14	Stakeholder Meetings- Tajikistan	2016
15	Report: Women empowerment in Tajikistan- Stories of Change	2016
16	Report: Mid-Term Evaluation Finland's Development Cooperation in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, 2014-2017. Wider Europe Initiative, Phase II	2016
17	Concept note: Investing in Value Chains: Aid for Trade in Central Asia	2016
18	Stakeholder Meetings: Minutes of the Project Board Meeting in Uzbekistan	2016
19	Combined Delivery Report	2017
20	Cost Sharing Agreement	2017
21	Progress Report	2017
22	AWPS and Budget Revisions	2017
23	Report: Product mapping for Finnish and Tajik Markets	2017
24	Report: Promotion of trade for structural reforms and inclusive development in selected countries of Central Asia (Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan)	2017
25	Report: “Barriers to Female Entrepreneurship in Tajikistan” Micronarrative study	2017
26	Concept note: Resilience – Sustainability – Regeneration, Growth and equality in Central Asia	2017
27	Progress Report	2018
28	Combined Delivery Report	2018
29	AWPS and Budget Revisions	2018

30	Concept note: A Concept Note and Programme for B2B meeting between Tajik and EU countries stakeholders	2018
31	Report: Export marketing strategies for Tajik products to EU markets	2018
32	Report: General report on expansion of Tajik products to EU markets in frame of “Wider Europe: Aid for Trade in Central Asia” project	2018
33	Report: Report on conducted assessment of EU markets and 3 Tajik products having high potential to export to identified EU markets	2018
34	Report: Report on identified EU markets requirements and existing barriers for dried apricot and mixed dried fruits and nuts, as well as on defined EU markets opportunities	2018
35	Report: Report on identified EU markets requirements and existing barriers for fresh apricots and fresh grapes, as well as on defined EU markets opportunities	2018
36	Report: Report on identified EU markets requirements and existing barriers for liquorice, as well as on defined EU markets opportunities	2018
37	Report: Report on identified EU markets requirements and existing barriers for walnuts, as well as on defined EU markets opportunities	2018
38	Report: List of the most relevant exhibitions in EU countries to promote Tajik products	2018
39	Report: Walk-through energy audit for LLC “Oro Isfara”	2018
40	Report: Walk-through energy audit for LLC “Porsoi Khujand (Fayzi Rasul)”	2018
41	Report: The Energy Management Toolbox- Energy Management, Measuring and Interpreting, Monitoring and Verification of usage and consumption of energy	2018

ANNEX 2: SOW, EVALUATION QUESTIONS, AND EVALUATION SUB-QUESTIONS

Scope of Work as defined in Consultants' TOR	Evaluation questions	Evaluation sub-questions
Relevance		
Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards the intended results. Review how the project addressed countries' priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?	1. Has the project strategy been relevant and appropriate to ensure the intended results?	1.1. Have the project impact and outcome contributed to the priorities outlined in UNDAF for each country and in the Regional Program Document? 1.2. Has the method of delivery been appropriate to secure intended impacts (goals)?
	2. Has the project concept been in line with the national strategic and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries?	2.1. Has the method of delivery selected by the project and intended and observed outcomes been in line with the national and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries? 2.2. Have the perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes been considered during the project design and implementation processes?
Measuring the changes on human development that are caused by the project outputs, specifically for job creation, livelihood improvements, sales/export increases, and facilitating ease of business, including capacity development and access to more efficient and transparent business processes.	3. Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship? ⁴⁰	3.1. Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship?
Effectiveness		

⁴⁰ "The overall goal (impact) of the project is: 'By 2017, supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship'", ProDoc, page 6

Scope of Work as defined in Consultants' TOR	Evaluation questions	Evaluation sub-questions
Measuring change in the observed output and outcome. Assessing the value of the change (positive and/or negative). Attributing observed changes or progress towards the project.	4. To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and outputs?	4.1. Has the project met the component level outcome targets? 4.2. Has the project met the output targets? 4.3. How have the project activities and joint initiatives impacted partner organizations? 4.4. Have project interventions been appropriate and effective?
	5. Can observed changes or progress be attributed towards project?	5.1. Have the project activities and respective outputs contributed to the observed outcomes? 5.2. Can the observed changes in partner organizations be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?
Efficiency		
Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost effective?	6. Have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?	6.1. Have project resources been used efficiently? 6.2. Has the cost minimization strategy used by the project been effective?
Management		
Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, management arrangements, and monitoring. ⁴¹	7. How successful have project strategic management, planning, monitoring and evaluation, and outreach activities been?	7.1. How successful and timebound has ongoing cooperation between the UNDP IRH and country offices been? 7.2. How successful have project planning and monitoring and evaluation activities been? 7.3. How successful have project outreach efforts been (dialogue with the Government and implementing partners and engagement of stakeholders)?
Sustainability		

⁴¹ Annex 1 of the TOR

Scope of Work as defined in Consultants' TOR	Evaluation questions	Evaluation sub-questions
Measuring to what extent the benefits of the outputs will continue after the project ends. Assessing sustainability by evaluating to what extent the capacity can be maintained.	8. Will the benefits that resulted from the project activities continue through adequate ownership and the implementation capacity of AFT stakeholders?	<p>8.1. Have the project activities been designed with a view to passing over responsibilities to local partners?</p> <p>8.2. Will the benefits of the outputs continue after the project completion?</p> <p>8.3. Can the capacity be maintained by AFT stakeholders?</p> <p>8.4. Are partnerships / collaborations in place between government agencies, the private sector, and SMEs to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?</p> <p>8.5. Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?</p>
Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups		
<p>Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?</p> <p>To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?</p> <p>To what extent does the project contribute to UN_SWAP performance indicators?</p> <p>How have the project activities contributed to gender equality?⁴²</p>	9. To what extent have the project activities contributed to gender equality?	<p>9.1. Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?</p> <p>9.2. Has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?</p> <p>9.3. Has the project contributed to UN_SWAP performance indicators?</p> <p>9.4. Has the project activities contributed to new jobs and higher wages for women, as well as promoted sales in women-owned SMEs?</p>
Evaluations in UNDP are guided by the principles of human rights and gender equality. As a result, when collecting data, evaluators	10. Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups	10.1. Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?

⁴² The last question is based was raised in the section on effectiveness of the TOR

Scope of Work as defined in Consultants' TOR	Evaluation questions	Evaluation sub-questions
need to ensure that women and disadvantaged groups are adequately represented	benefited from the work of the project?	

ANNEX 3: CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

RELEVANCE	
11. Has the project strategy been relevant and appropriate to ensure the intended results?	
11.1. Have the project impact and outcome contributed to the priorities outlined in UNDAF for each country and in the Regional Program Document?	
<i>Checklist question 1.1.a:</i> Has the project impact and outcome contributed to the priorities outlined in UNDAF for each country and in the Regional Program Document?	
11.2. Has the method of delivery been appropriate to secure the intended impacts (goals)?	
<i>Checklist question 1.2.a:</i> Was the method of delivery of the project (regional/local, macro/meso/micro) appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in partner countries?	
<i>Checklist question 1.2.b:</i> Did stakeholders have adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	
12. Has the project concept been in line with the national strategic and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries?	
12.1. Have the method of delivery and intended and observed outcomes of the project been in line with the national and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries?	
<i>Checklist question 2.1.a:</i> Are the following project implementation approaches in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts • Increase sales volumes, generate new jobs and higher wages, specifically in SMEs operating in the regions 	
<i>Checklist question 2.1.b:</i> Have AFT stakeholders supported the long-term objectives of the project, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship promotion?	
12.2. Were the perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes considered during the project design and implementation processes?	
<i>Checklist question 2.2.a:</i> Were the perspectives of stakeholders considered during the project design process and implementation?	
<i>Checklist question 2.2.b:</i> Have effective feedback channels been established between the project and stakeholders, and has the project responded to the needs of stakeholders during the implementation stage?	
13. Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship?⁴³	
EFFECTIVENESS	
14. To what extent did the project achieve intended outcomes and outputs?	
14.1. Has the project met the component level outcome targets?	

⁴³ “The overall goal (impact) of the project is: ‘By 2017, supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship’”, ProDoc, page 6

<i>Checklist question 3.1.a:</i> How many additional jobs have been created in supported SMEs (disaggregated by gender) ⁴⁴ ?
<i>Checklist question 3.1.b:</i> What is the increase in sales volumes in supported SMEs? ⁴⁵
<i>Checklist question 3.1.c:</i> What impact has the project had on increasing wage bills in supported SMEs ⁴⁶ (including through the engagement of business development services providers ⁴⁷)?
<i>Checklist question 3.1.d:</i> What percentage of targeted companies reported that the reduction of trade barriers had a positive impact on business performance in annual questionnaires? ⁴⁸
14.2. Has the project met the output targets?
<i>Checklist question 3.2.a:</i> What percentage of output targets has the project met?
14.3. Have project interventions been appropriate and effective?
<i>Checklist question 3.3.a:</i> Have the project interventions been appropriate/effective?
<i>Checklist question 3.3.b:</i> Has the project improved the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of MGP?
<i>Checklist question 3.3.c:</i> Has the project improved the capacities of TSIs to promote sales volumes and generate new jobs and higher wages in partner SMEs?
<i>Checklist question 3.3.d:</i> Have the project activities contributed to positive changes for agriproduct processors and producers?
14.4. How have the project activities and joint initiatives impacted AFT stakeholders?
<i>Checklist question 3.4.a:</i> In which areas has the project seen the greatest achievements, and what contributed to that success?
<i>Checklist question 3.4.n:</i> In which areas has the project had the fewest achievements, and why?
15. Can observed changes or progress be attributed to the project?
15.1. Have the project activities and respective outputs contributed to the observed outcomes?
<i>Checklist question 4.1.a:</i> How has the delivery of outputs led to outcome-level progress?
<i>Checklist question 4.1.b:</i> Have there been any unexpected outcome-level results achieved beyond the planned outcome?
<i>Checklist question 4.1.c:</i> Has the project contributed to the reduction of trade barriers between the countries?
15.2. Can the observed changes in partner organizations be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?
<i>Checklist question 4.2.a:</i> Can the observed changes in MGP (such as trade policy formulation/implementation capacity development) be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?
<i>Checklist question 4.2.b:</i> Can the observed changes in TSIs (such as sales expansion and job creation capacity development in partner SMEs) be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?

⁴⁴ Micro level outcome indicator and target

⁴⁵ Micro level outcome indicator and target

⁴⁶ Micro level outcome indicator and target

⁴⁷ Meso level outcome indicator and target

⁴⁸ Macro level outcome indicator and target

<i>Checklist question 4.2.c: Can the observed changes in SMEs (increase in sales, job creation, increase in wages) be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?</i>
EFFICIENCY
16. Has the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
16.1. Have project resources been used efficiently?
<i>Checklist question 5.1.a: Have the project structure (regional and local focus) and partnership modalities (working in parallel with the MGP, TSIs, and SMEs) allowed resources to be used efficiently?</i>
<i>Checklist question 5.1.b: Have there been any delays regarding the activities that AFT stakeholders were involved in?</i>
<i>Checklist question 5.1.c: Were the project activities and outputs been delivered on time?</i>
<i>Checklist question 5.1.d: In what ways could this project have been more efficient?</i>
16.2. Has the cost minimization strategy used by the project been effective?
<i>Checklist question 5.2.a: What cost minimization strategies were used? Has the project considered alternative activities to streamline cost effectiveness?</i>
<i>Checklist question 5.2.b: Could the project have delivered the same services with less recourse/expenses? If so, how?</i>
<i>Checklist question 5.2.c: Have monitoring systems provided UNDP staff with a stream of data that allows it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?</i>
<i>Checklist question 5.2.d: Has the project engaged and coordinated with the AFT stakeholders, donor community, and implementing partners?</i>
MANAGEMENT
17. How successful have project strategic management, planning, monitoring and evaluation, and outreach activities been?
17.1. How successful and timebound has ongoing cooperation between the UNDP IRH and country offices been?
<i>Checklist question 6.1.a: How effective and timebound has ongoing cooperation been between the UNDP IRH and country offices?</i>
<i>Checklist question 6.1.b: What can be done to further streamline the workflow (staffing, reporting relationships, processes)?</i>
17.2. How successful have project planning and monitoring and evaluation activities been?
<i>Checklist question 6.2.a: How effective have project planning and monitoring and evaluation activities been?</i>
<i>Checklist question 6.2.b: What can be done to further streamline the work planning and M&E activities?</i>
17.3. How successful have project outreach efforts been (dialogue with the government and implementing partners, and engagement of stakeholders)?
<i>Checklist question 6.3.a: How effective have project outreach efforts been?</i>
<i>Checklist question 6.3.b: What can be done to further streamline the project outreach activities?</i>
SUSTAINABILITY

18. Will the benefits that resulted from the project activities continue through adequate ownership and the implementation capacity of AFT stakeholders?
18.1. Have the project activities been designed with a view to passing over responsibilities to local partners?
<i>Checklist question 7.1.a:</i> Have the project activities been designed with a view to passing over responsibilities to local partners?
<i>Checklist question 7.1.b:</i> Will human and institutional (mechanisms, procedures, and policies) capacities be available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?
<i>Checklist question 7.1.c:</i> Are financial resources available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?
18.2. Will the benefits of the outputs continue after the project completion?
<i>Checklist question 7.2.a:</i> How will the benefits of the outputs continue after the project in each country?
<i>Checklist question 7.2.b:</i> Are there any social, political, or economic risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs, including female employment and entrepreneurship?
18.3. Can the capacity be maintained by AFT stakeholders?
<i>Checklist question 7.3.a:</i> Are trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of MGP in place to sustain the results and benefits supported by the project?
<i>Checklist question 7.3.b:</i> Are advisory and technical support capacities of TSIs in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?
<i>Checklist question 7.3.c:</i> Are production, quality control, transportation, marketing, and/or sales capacities in partner SMEs in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?
18.4. Are partnerships/collaborations in place between government agencies, the private sector, and SMEs to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?
<i>Checklist question 7.4.a:</i> Are SMEs willing to continue collaborating with TSIs to develop their sales/export promotion and job creation capacities?
<i>Checklist question 7.4.b:</i> Are TSIs involved in trade policy formulation and implementation activities carried out by MGP?
<i>Checklist question 7.4.c:</i> How strong are the partnerships/collaborations of government agencies and donor organizations with TSIs and SMEs to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?
<i>Checklist question 7.4.d:</i> Are developmental/donor partners or the government ready to commit additional funding to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the project?
<i>Checklist question 7.4.e:</i> Will the partner SMEs be willing to pay a small fee for services like the ones provided by the project?
<i>Checklist question 7.4.f:</i> How have the project design, implementation strategy, and partnership approach (between UNDP and AFT stakeholders, as well as between different stakeholders) helped to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?
18.5. Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?
CROSS-CUTTING: GENDER AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS
19. To what extent have the project activities contributed to gender equality?

19.1. Is the gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?
19.2. Has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?
<i>Checklist question 8.2.a:</i> Has the project improved the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of female employees in MGP?
<i>Checklist question 8.2.b:</i> Were gender-specific legal and regulatory interventions designed and implemented in partnership with the project?
<i>Checklist question 8.2.c:</i> Has the project improved the capacities of female employees of TSIs to provide services to local SMEs?
<i>Checklist question 8.2.d:</i> Has the project improved the capacities of TSIs to promote sales volumes in women-owned SMEs and/or generate new jobs and higher wages for women in partner SMEs?
<i>Checklist question 8.2.e:</i> Were specific interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs?
<i>Checklist question 8.2.f:</i> Were there other intended or unintended effects as a result of interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SME?
19.3. Has the project contributed to UN_SWAP performance indicators?
19.4. Have the project activities contributed to new jobs and higher wages for women, as well as promoted sales in women-owned SMEs?
<i>Checklist question 8.4.a:</i> Has the project met gender-related outcome and output targets?
<i>Checklist question 8.4.b:</i> Has the project support led to new jobs for women and higher wages for women in SMEs?
<i>Checklist question 8.4.c:</i> Has the project support promoted sales volumes in women-owned SMEs?
20. Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?

ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire for UNDP staff

N	Question	Number of the evaluation question linked to
RELEVANCE		
1.	Has the project impact and outcome contributed to the priorities outlined in UNDAF for each country and in the Regional Program Document?	1.1
2.	Was the method of delivery of the project (regional/local, macro/meso/micro) appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in partner countries?	1.2
3.	Are the following project implementation approaches in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts • Increase sales volumes, generate new jobs and higher wages, specifically in SMEs operating in the regions 	2.1
4.	Were the perspectives of stakeholders considered during the project design process and implementation?	2.2
5.	Have effective feedback channels been established between the project and stakeholders, and has the project responded to the needs of stakeholders during the implementation stage?	2.2
EFFECTIVENESS and EFFICIENCY		
6.	Discussion of project outcome and output level achievements (including gender-related).	3.1
7.	Have the project interventions been appropriate/effective?	3.3
8.	In which areas has the project seen the greatest achievements, and what contributed to that success?	3.4
9.	In which areas has the project seen the fewest achievements, and why?	3.4
10.	How has the delivery of outputs led to outcome-level progress?	4.1
11.	Have there been any unexpected outcome-level results achieved beyond the planned outcome? Has the project considered alternative activities to streamline cost-effectiveness?	4.1
12.	Has the project structure (regional and local focus), partnership modalities (working in parallel with the MGP, TSIs, and SMEs) allowed resources to be used efficiently?	5.1
13.	Have the project activities and outputs been delivered on time?	5.1
14.	What cost minimization strategies have been used?	5.2
15.	Have the monitoring systems provided UNDP staff with a stream of data, allowing it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?	5.2

16.	Has the project engaged and coordinated with the AFT stakeholders, donor community, and implementing partners?	5.2
MANAGEMENT		
17.	How effective and timebound has ongoing cooperation been between the UNDP IRH and country offices? What can be done to further streamline the workflow (staffing, reporting relationships, processes)?	6.1
18.	How effective have project planning and monitoring and evaluation activities been? What can be done to further streamline the work planning and M&E activities?	6.2
19.	How effective have project outreach efforts been? What can be done to further streamline the project outreach activities?	6.3
SUSTAINABILITY		
20.	Have the project activities been designed with a view to passing over responsibilities to local partners?	7.1
21.	How will the benefits of the outputs continue After the project in each country?	7.2
22.	Are there any social, political, or economic risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship?	7.2
23.	Are developmental/donor partners or the government ready to commit additional funding to ensure the continuation of services After the end of the project?	7.4
24.	How have the project design, implementation strategy, and partnership approach (between UNDP and AFT stakeholders, as well as between different stakeholders) helped to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?	7.4
25.	Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?	7.5
CROSS-CUTTING: GENDER AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS		
26.	Has the project improved the following? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of female employees in MGP - Capacities of female employees of TSIs to provide services to local SMEs 	8.2
27.	Were gender-specific legal and regulatory interventions designed and implemented in partnership with the project?	8.2
28.	Has the project improved the capacities of TSIs to promote sales volumes and generate new jobs and higher wages in partner SMEs?	8.2
29.	Were specific interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs?	8.2
30.	Were there any unintended effects as a result of interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs?	8.2
31.	Has the project support led to new jobs and higher wages for women in SMEs?	8.4
32.	Has the project support promoted sales volumes and generated new jobs and higher wages in women-owned SMEs?	8.4

33.	Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	9
34.	Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship?	10

Questionnaire for Main Government Counterparts

N	Question	Number of the evaluation question linked to
RELEVANCE		
1.	Was the method of delivery of the project (regional/local, macro/meso/micro) appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in partner countries?	1.2
2.	Did stakeholders have adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	1.2
3.	Are the following project implementation approaches in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? - Focus on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts - Increase sales volumes, generate new jobs and higher wages, specifically in SME operating in the regions	2.1
4.	Have AFT stakeholders supported the long-term project objectives, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship promotion?	2.1
5.	Were the perspectives of AFT stakeholders considered during the project design process and implementation?	2.2
6.	Have effective feedback channels been established between the project and stakeholders, and has the project responded to the needs of stakeholders during the implementation stage?	2.2
EFFECTIVENESS and EFFICIENCY		
7.	Has the project improved the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of MGPI?	3.3
8.	In which areas has the project seen the greatest achievements, and what contributed to that success?	3.4
9.	In which areas has the project seen the fewest achievements, and why?	3.4
10.	Has the project contributed to the reduction of trade barriers between the countries?	4.1
11.	Can the observed changes in MGP (such as trade policy formulation/implementation capacity development) be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	4.2
12.	Have there been any delays regarding the activities where the AFT stakeholder was involved?	5.1

13.	In what ways could this project have been more efficient?	5.1
14.	Could have the project delivered the same services with less recourse/expenses? If so, how?	5.2
SUSTAINABILITY		
15.	Will human and institutional (mechanisms, procedures and policies) capacities be available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?	7.1
16.	Are financial resources available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?	7.1
17.	Are there any social, political, or economic risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship?	7.2
18.	Are trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of MGP in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?	7.3
19.	Are TSIs involved in trade policy formulation and implementation activities carried out by MGP?	7.4
20.	How strong are the partnerships/collaborations of government agencies and donor organizations with TSIs and SMEs to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?	7.4
21.	Are developmental/donor partners or the government ready to commit additional funding to ensure the continuation of services After the end of the project?	7.4
22.	Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?	7.5
CROSS-CUTTING: GENDER AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS		
23.	Has the project improved the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of female employees in MGP?	8.2
24.	Were gender-specific legal and regulatory interventions designed and implemented in partnership with the project?	8.2
25.	Discussion of intended and unintended effects as a result of interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs	8.2
26.	Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	9

Questionnaire for Trade Support Institutions

N	Question	Number of the evaluation question linked to
RELEVANCE		

1.	Was the method of delivery of the project (regional/local, macro/meso/micro) appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in partner countries?	1.2
2.	Did stakeholders have adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	1.2
3.	Are the following project implementation approaches in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts • Increase sales volumes, generate new jobs and higher wages, specifically, in SMEs operating in the regions 	2.1
4.	Have AFT stakeholders supported the long-term objectives of the project, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship promotion?	2.1
5.	Were the perspectives of stakeholders considered during the project design process and implementation?	2.2
6.	Have effective feedback channels been established between the project and stakeholders, and has the project responded to the needs of stakeholders during the implementation stage?	2.2
EFFECTIVENESS and EFFICIENCY		
7.	Has the project improved the capacities of TSIs to promote sales volumes and generate new jobs and higher wages in partner SMEs?	3.3
8.	In which areas has the project seen the greatest achievements, and what contributed to that success?	3.4
9.	In which areas has the project seen the fewest achievements, and why?	3.4
10.	Has the project contributed to the reduction of trade barriers between the countries?	4.1
11.	Can the observed changes in TSIs (such as sales expansion and job creation capacity development in partner SME) be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	4.2
12.	Have there been any delays regarding activities in which the AFT stakeholder was involved?	5.1
13.	In what ways could this project have been more efficient?	5.1
14.	Could have the project delivered the same services with less recourse/expenses? If so, how?	5.2
SUSTAINABILITY		
15.	Will human and institutional (mechanisms, procedures and policies) capacities be available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?	7.1
16.	Are financial resources available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?	7.1
17.	Are there any social, political, or economic risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship?	7.2

18.	Are advisory and technical support capacities of TSIs in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?	7.3
19.	Are TSIs involved in trade policy formulation and implementation activities carried out by MGP?	7.4
20.	Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?	7.5
CROSS-CUTTING: GENDER AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS		
21.	Has the project improved the capacities of female employees of TSIs to provide services to local SMEs?	8.2
22.	Has the project improved the capacities of TSIs to promote sales volumes in women-owned SMEs and/or generate new jobs and higher wages for women in partner SMEs?	8.2
23.	Discussion of intended and unintended effects as a result of interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs	8.2
24.	Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	9

Questionnaire for SMEs

N	Question	Number of the evaluation question linked to
RELEVANCE		
1.	Was the method of delivery of the project (regional/local, macro/meso/micro) appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in partner countries?	1.2
2.	Did AFT stakeholders have adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	1.2
3.	Have AFT stakeholders supported the project's long-term objectives, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship promotion?	2.1
4.	Have effective feedback channels established between the project and stakeholders and has the project responded to the needs of stakeholders during the implementation stage?	2.2
EFFECTIVENESS and EFFICIENCY		
5.	Has the project activities contributed to positive changes on agriproduct processors and producers?	3.3
6.	In which areas has the project seen the greatest achievements, and what contributed to that success?	3.4
7.	In which areas has the project seen the fewest achievements, and why?	3.4

8.	Can the observed changes in the SME (increase in sales, job creation, increase in wages) be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	4.2
9.	Have there been any delays regarding activities in which the AFT stakeholder was involved?	5.1
10.	In what ways could this project have been more efficient?	5.1
11.	Could have the project delivered the same services with less recourse/expenses? If so, how?	5.2
SUSTAINABILITY		
12.	Will human and institutional (mechanisms, procedures and policies) capacities be available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?	7.1
13.	Are financial resources available in partner organizations to carry forward the activities supported by the project?	7.1
14.	Are there any social, political, or economic risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs, including in terms of female employment and entrepreneurship?	7.2
15.	Are production, quality control, transportation, marketing, and/or sales capacities in partner SMEs in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?	7.3
16.	Are SMEs willing to continue collaborating with TSIs to develop their sales/export promotion and job creation capacities?	7.4
17.	How strong are partnerships/collaborations of government agencies and donor organizations with TSIs and SMEs to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?	7.4
18.	Will partner SMEs be willing to pay a small fee for services like the ones provided by the project?	7.4
19.	Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?	7.5
CROSS-CUTTING: GENDER AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS		
20.	Were specific interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs?	8.2
21.	Discussion of intended and unintended effects as a result of interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in SMEs.	8.2
22.	Has the project support led to new jobs for women and to higher wages for women in the partner SMEs? Has the project support promoted sales volumes in women-owned SMEs (if applicable)?	8.4
23.	Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	9

ANNEX 5: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE – MGP & TSI

N	Question	Answer
Relevance		
1.	The project worked both at the regional level to promote regional trade in central Asia and at the country level to (1) improve the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities in partner government agencies, (2) ensure that appropriate services are provided by Trade Support Organizations ⁴⁹ , and (3) improve productivity in partner SMEs. To what extent was the referenced method of delivery appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in your country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very appropriate - Appropriate - Somehow appropriate - Not appropriate - Don't know
2.	The project focused on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts. To what extent is this approach in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of your country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very appropriate - Appropriate - Somehow appropriate - Not appropriate - Don't know
3.	The main target of the project was to increase sales volumes and generate new jobs and higher wages, specifically in SMEs operating in the regions. To what extent is this approach in line with the national development priorities of your country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very appropriate - Appropriate - Somehow appropriate - Not appropriate - Don't know
4.	Has your organization had adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes - Much - Somewhat - Little - No
5.	To what extent has your organization supported the long-term objectives of the project — increased employment and entrepreneurship opportunities (including for women)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
6.	To what extent were the perspectives of your organization or other government agencies, industry/business associations, and other stakeholders considered during the project design process and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know

⁴⁹ Trade Support Organizations are Trade, industry and business associations, Private consulting firms, Training and research centers, National export promotion agencies and other quasi-public organizations and corporations.

N	Question	Answer
7.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	
Effectiveness and Efficiency		
8.	The question is for MGP only: To what extent has the project improved the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities in your organization and other partner government agencies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
	The question is for TSI only: To what extent has the project improved the capacities of your organization and other Trade Support Organizations to promote sales volumes and generate new jobs and higher wages in partner SMEs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
9.	To what extent has the project contributed to the reduction of trade barriers between the countries in central Asia?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
10.	The question is for MGP only: To what extent do you attribute observed changes in your organization (such as trade policy formulation/implementation capacity development) to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
	The question is for TSI only: To what extent do you attribute observed changes in your organization (such as sales expansion and job creation capacity development in partner SMEs) to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
11.	To what extent has the project structure (regional and local focus) and partnership modalities (working in parallel with partner government agencies, TSIs, and SMEs) allowed resources to be used efficiently?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
12.	Have there been any delays regarding the activities your organization was involved in?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Never - Very rarely - Occasionally - Always - Don't know
13.	Could the project have delivered the same services with less recourse/expenses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, project operated efficiently

N	Question	Answer
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very probable, but project operated efficiently - Probably - Yes, project did not operate efficiently - Don't know
14.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	
Sustainability		
15.	The question is for MGP only: To what extent are trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of your organization in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
	The question is for TSI only: To what extent are advisory and technical support capacities of your organization in place to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
16.	To what extent are human and institutional (mechanisms, procedures and policies) capacities available to allow your organizations to carry forward and expand the activities supported by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
17.	To what extent financial resources are available in your organization to carry forward and expand the activities supported by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
18.	To what extent are TSIs involved in trade policy formulation and implementation activities carried out by MGP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
19.	To what extent is strong partnership/collaboration of partner government agencies and Trade Support Agencies with SMEs available to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know

N	Question	Answer
20.	Are developmental/donor partners or the government ready to commit additional funding to ensure the continuation of services After the end of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes - Much - Somewhat - Little - No
21.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	-
Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups		
22.	<u>The question is for MGP only:</u> To what extent has the project improved the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities of female employees in partner government agencies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
	<u>The question is for TSI only:</u> To what extent has the project improved the capacities of female employees of your organization to provide services to local SMEs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
23.	<u>The question is for MGP only:</u> To what extent were gender-specific legal and regulatory interventions designed and implemented in partnership with the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
	<u>The question is for TSI only:</u> To what extent has the project strengthened the capacity of your organization to promote job creation and higher wages among women and/or promote sales in women-owned SMEs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
24.	To what extent have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
25.	To what extent have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
26.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	

ANNEX 6: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE – SME

N	Question	Answer
Relevance		
1.	The project worked both at the regional level to promote regional trade in central Asia and at the country level to (1) improve the trade policy formulation and implementation capacities in partner government agencies, (2) ensure that appropriate services are provided by Trade Support Organizations ⁵⁰ , and (3) improve productivity in partner SMEs. To what extent was the referenced method of delivery appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in your country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very appropriate - Appropriate - Somehow appropriate - Not appropriate - Don't know
2.	Has your organization had adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes - Much - Somewhat - Little - No
3.	To what extent has your organization supported the long-term objectives of the project — increased employment and entrepreneurship opportunities (including for women)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
4.	To what extent has the project responded to your needs during the implementation stage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
5.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	
Effectiveness and Efficiency		
6.	To what extent have the project activities contributed to positive changes on agriproduct processors and producers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
7.	To what extent do you attribute observed changes in your organization (increase in sales, job creation, increase in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little

⁵⁰ Trade Support Organizations are Trade, industry and business associations, Private consulting firms, Training and research centers, National export promotion agencies and other quasi-public organizations and corporations.

N	Question	Answer
	wages) to the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not at all - Don't know
8.	Could have the project deliver the same services with less recourse/expenses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, project operated efficiently - Very Probably, project operated efficiently - Probably - Yes, project did not operate efficiently - Don't know
9.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	
Sustainability		
10.	To what extent are production, quality control, transportation, marketing, and/or sales capacities in your organization in place to sustain the results and benefits supported by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
11.	To what extent are human and institutional (mechanisms, procedures and policies) capacities available in your organization to carry forward and expand the activities supported by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
12.	To what extent financial resources are available in your organization to carry forward and expand the activities supported by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
13.	To what extent you are willing to continue collaborating with TSIs to strengthen the sales/export promotion and job creation capacities of your organization?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
14.	To what extent is strong partnership/collaboration of the partner government agencies and Trade Support Agencies with your organization and other SMEs available to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
15.	Would you be willing to pay a small fee for services like the ones provided by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Definitely - Very probably - Probably

N	Question	Answer
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Probably not - Don't know
16.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	
Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups		
17.	To what extent were specific interventions designed and implemented by the project to promote female entrepreneurship and employment in your organizations and other SMEs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
18.	To what extent has the project support led to new jobs and higher wages for women in your organization?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
19.	To what extent has the project support promoted sales volumes and generated new jobs and higher wages in women-owned SMEs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
20.	To what extent have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
21.	To what extent have the project activities positively impacted your livelihoods and the livelihoods of those who work with you?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To a great extent - Sufficiently - Very little - Not at all - Don't know
22.	Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant.	

ANNEX 7: THE LIST OF PROSPECTIVE MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS

Stakeholder / partner	Number of meetings	Anticipated duration
UNDP Country Office staff (including AFT project staff)	2-3 meetings	0.5 day
MGP, TSI and SME representatives in the capital city, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Economy/Trade and/or Ministry of Agriculture - Government agency responsible for policy implementation (such as an export / investment promotion agency) - Leading private consulting firm (trade support services provider) - Women-focused business association or NGO - Leading business/ trade association - Leading agribusiness focused industry association - Major donor/implemented partner - Export oriented SME 	6-7 meetings	1 day
MGP and TSI representatives in regions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representative of the central government in the region - Local business/trade association, NGO, or donor-funded project that promotes female entrepreneurship and employment in the region - Local private consulting firm or local industry association 	2-3 meetings	0.5 day
SME representatives in regions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Export-focused SME - Women-owned SME or an SME that employs primarily women - Leading local SME (industry champion) 	4-5 meetings	1 day

Annex 8: FINAL TRIP AGENDA

Day 1 in Tajikistan: Monday, 13 May 2019	
9:30-10:50	Meeting with AFT staff - Parviz Rashidov, Gulsara Mamadjonova Venue: UNDP AFT Office
11:00-11:45	Meeting with Mubin Rustamov, UNDP CO, ARR/Programme Venue: UNDP AFT Office
12:00-12:50	Meeting with Ms. Nazrizoda Saidrakhmon, Former First DM of MEDT, Nazrizoda Saidrakhmon Venue: UNDP AFT Office
13:00-14:00	Meeting with Mr. Zuhridin Kenjaev, Head of the main department on trade and foreign trade, Ministry of Economic development and Trade Venue: Ministry of Economic development and Trade
14:05-14:45	Meeting at the Agency on Statistics under President of Tajikistan Participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Shokirzoda Shodmon, First Deputy Chairman, - Ms. Rajabova N., Head of Business Registry Department, Classifiers and Dissemination of Statistical Information; - Mr. Asmatbekov F., Head of department Trade and services statistics Venue: Agency on Statistics
15:50-15:45	Meeting with Mr. Shavkat Bazarov, Director of NASIP APK Venue: UNDP AFT Office
16:00-17:00	Meeting with Ms. Nigina Anvari, Deputy Chairman of the State Committee on Investment and State Property Management (SCISPM) Venue: SCISPM
17:00-17:40	Meeting with Ms. Saiyora Abdullaeva, Head of department, TPC Coordinator, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Tajikistan Venue: UNDP AFT Office
17:40-18:20	Meeting with Ms. Khairinisso Rasulova, Deputy Chairman, Association "Women and Society" Venue: UNDP AFT Office
Day 2 in Tajikistan: Tuesday, 14 May 2019	
08:00-17:30	Field trip to Khatlon region
10:00-10:45	Meeting with Mr. Zafar Alizoda, Secretary of Consultative Council (CC) of Khatlon region Venue: CC office
11:00-12:00	Meeting with Mr. Ilhomiddin Ismoilov-Director of "Sarvati Vakhsh" micro credit fund and Ms. Dilorom Rakhimova, Credit manager Venue: "Sarvati Vakhsh" MCF
13:00-14.00	Meeting with Jamilya Aminova, women-entrepreneur, (purchasing of equipment for creation of ride) Venue: Levakant, Khatlon region

14.00-15:30	Meeting with, Mahmadnabi Akramov (private entrepreneur / beekeeper) Venue: Vakhsh district, Khatlon region
15:30-17:30	Travel back to Dushanbe
Day 3 in Tajikistan: Wednesday, 15 May 2019	
06:00-06:45	Flight Dushanbe-Khujand
10:00-11:00	Meeting with Mr. Abdumubin Fayziev, Director of association of exporters (MAPEST) Venue: MAPEST office, Isfara town
11:15-12:00	LLC Oro Isfara (exporter), Meeting with Mr. Mirzorahim Ravshanzoda, Marketing Manager of Oro Isfara LLC (exporter) Venue: Oro Isfara LLC, Isfara
13:15-14:00	LLC Mevai tilloi (exporter), Meeting with Mr. Khairullo Rizoev, General director of Mevai tilloi LLC Venue: Mevai tilloi LLC, Isfara
14:15-15:00	Meeting with Mr. Jamshed Buzurukov, Director of IsfaraFood LLC Venue: IsfaraFood LLC, Isfara
15:15-16:30	Meeting with Mr. Fattoev I., B. Faizullaev, Golib Urunov, etc Cross border trade in bordering zones TJK-KRG Venue: Khukumat of Isfara
16:30-18:00	Travel to Khujand
Day 4 in Tajikistan: Thursday, 16 May 2019	
08:00-17:00	Meso and micro levels
08:00-09:30	Meeting with Mr. Yakubi A., Deputy Chairman on economic issues Venue: Khukumat of Sughd region, Khujand
09:45-10:30	Mr. Bakhtiyor Bahriddinov, head of IT department at Neksigol Mushovir (AIMS development, Agroinform.tj) Venue: Neksigol Mushovir office, Khujand
10:30-11:15	Meetings with AIMS clients / farmers. Participants: - Mrs. Nodira Avezova, Isfara district, - Mr. Dilmurod Kunduzov, B. Gafurov district Venue: Neksigol Mushovir office, Khujand
11:30-12:15	Meeting at National Association of Businesswomen of Tajikistan (NABWT) - Mrs. Muhabbat Nozimova, Deputy Director, - Mrs. Firuza Makhmudova, Financial Director, - Mrs. Takhmina Karimova, Coordinator on handicrafts Venue: NABWT office
13:15-14:15	Meeting with TSIs/consulting companies of Sughd region. Participants: - LLC Rushd, Association of Entrepreneurs of Sughd region (AESO) - Association of Agrobusiness of Tajikistan - PO "Quality Management Center" Venue: UNDP KHJ FPO
14:30 -15:15	Meeting at Free Economic Zone (FEZ) "Sughd". Participants: - Mr. Firdavs Olimzoda-Head of FEZ Administration

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Aliya Hamidullina, Head of Information and analytic department Venue: FEZ Sughd office
16:00 -19:00	Travel from Khujand to Tashkent by UNDP car
Day 1 in Uzbekistan: Monday, 20 May 2019	
10:00-11:00	Meeting with AFT staff Venue: UNDP CO
11:00-12:30	Meeting with UNDP Sustainable Development Cluster staff Venue: UNDP CO
15:00-15:45	Meeting on exchange of views on activities, implemented during Phase III of Aid for Trade Project. Participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Akmal Eshniyozov, Head of export marketing department (MIFT) - Mr. Ulugbek Kirgizbaev, Deputy director of «Uztrade» FTC - Mr. Abbos Reimov, Head of the Marketing Department, Agency for export promotion under MIFT - Mr. Farrukh Zakirov, Chief expert, WTO accession coordination department (MIFT) Venue: Ministry for Investments and Foreign Trade of the Republic of Uzbekistan
16:45-17:15	Meeting at “Uzstandart” agency. Participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Dilshod Sattarov, General director - Mr. Djavlan Kattakhodjaev, First deputy director - Mr. Abdullakhon Orifboev, Head of International Cooperation department Venue: “Uzstandart” Agency
17:30-18:15	Meeting with Mr Gofurjon Usmanov, Head of Unit, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Uzbekistan Venue: CCI
Day 2 Uzbekistan: Tuesday, 21 May 2019	
9:30-10:15	Meeting with Mr. Sardorkhon Muratov, Export manager, “Alimkhan Exim Group” trade promotion/consulting company Venue: “Alimkhan Exim Group” LLC (trade promotion company)
10:30-11:30	Meeting with Mrs. Guzal Kahharova, Country coordinator, GIZ regional Programme “Trade Facilitation in Central Asia” Venue: GIZ
13:30-18:00	Travel from Tashkent to Namangan (by car) and hotel check-in
Day 3 in Uzbekistan: Wednesday, 22 May 2019	
09:30-10:15	Meeting with Mr. Ayubkhon Kamalov, First deputy Khokim of Namangan Region Venue: Namangan Regional Khokimiyat
10:30-11:15	Meeting with Mr. K. Djamalov, Head of Namangan Regional Department of Chamber of Commerce and Industry Venue: Chamber of Commerce and Industry
11:30-12:15	Visit to polo and knit production facility ‘Imron Textile Group’

12:30-13:15	Visit to shoe production facility 'Dambog Poyabzali Savdo'
15:00-16:00	Visit to bags sewing facility "Rozdil Charm Savdo"
Day 4 in Uzbekistan: Thursday, 23 May 2019	
09:00-09:45	Travel to Chust District of Namangan Region
10:00-10:45	Visit to children's knit production facility 'Chust Uktamjon Servis'
10:45-11:15	Travel to Turakurgan District of Namangan Region
11:15-12:00	Visit to pilot project "System for monitoring, alerting and control of insect-pests and plant diseases" ('Sohil Pino Miskati' agro-firm)
14:00-15:20	Travel from Namangan to Andijan (by car)
15:30-16:15	Meeting with Mrs. Odinakhon Saidova, Director, LLC 'Agroproduct Export Agrofirma'
16:15-19:00	Arrival to Osh (Kyrgyzstan) from Namangan via 'Dostlik' checkpoint
Day 1 in Kyrgyzstan: Friday, 24 May 2019	
09:15-09:45	Security briefing Venue: UNDSS
09:50-10:30	Meeting with Ms. Mira Subankulova, Osh Area Manager (Area Based Development Office-hereafter ABD) Venue: UNDP Osh ABD
10:40-11:20	Meeting with Mr. Akhmadjan Makhammadov, Deputy of Plenipotentiary Representative of the Government in Osh Oblast Venue: Office of Administration
11:30-12:20	Meeting with Mr. Zamir Yusupov and visit the Center for Trade and Entrepreneurship Support in the Mayor of Osh Venue: Office of the Center at the Mayor of Osh
14:00-14:40	Visit IE Amandos Zikirov (crAFT goods) Ms. Gulzira Yrysbekova Venue: Clothing shop
14:40-15:00	Travel to UNDP Office in Osh
15:20-16:40	Meeting with AFT clients from Uzgen District and Djalal-Abad Oblast. Mr. Emil Sydykov, «Kapchygai Too Baly» cooperative Mr. Raiymkul Muratov, "Vega +" LLC Venue: UNDP Osh ABD
16:50-18:00	Meeting with regional associations in Osh region Ms. Aziza Yuldasheva, Association of Agro Businesses "Jer Azygy" Mr. Tynysbek Turdubekov, Interregional Branch of Ministry of Economy of the Kyrgyz Republic Venue: UNDP Osh ABD
Day 2 in Kyrgyzstan: Saturday, 25 May 2019	
9:00-9:50	Travel from Osh to Nookat District
10:00-10:50	Meeting with Nookat Altyn Almasy coop Mr. Kubanychbek Kaparov, Chairperson of cooperative
11:00-13:00	Travel from Nookat to Uzgen

13:10-14:00	Meeting with Mr. Asylbek Kumenov, Member of “Ozgon Kuruchu” (rice processor) and with Mr. Adan Kokkozov, seed cooperative “Ozgon Shaly” Venue: processing company office
14:10-15:30	Travel from Uzgen to Karasuu District
15:30-16:30	Visit Zoloto Doliny coop (corn VC) and meeting Mr. Dilmurad Boriev and Mr. Elbek Nasyrov Venue: Karasuu District, Joosh village
20:50-21:40	Travel from Osh to Bishkek (by air) Check in the hotel in Bishkek
Day 3 in Kyrgyzstan: Monday, 27 May 2019	
9:30-10:00	Meeting with Mr. Eldar Abakirov, Deputy Minister of Economy of Kyrgyz Republic (TBC) Venue: Ministry of Economy
10:10-11:00	Meeting with Mr. Nurlan Aripov, Head of Department on Export Promotion and Development of the Investment Promotion and Protection Agency Venue: Ministry of Economy
11:10-12:00	Meeting with clients of Investment Promotion and Protection Agency (1-2 companies TBC) Venue: Ministry of Economy
12:20-13:10	Meeting with Ms. Elvira Baijumanova, GIZ NaWi Project Specialist Venue: Office of GIZ
Day 4 in Kyrgyzstan: Tuesday, 28 May 2019	
9:30-10:15	Meeting with Mr. Farkhad Pakyro, Executive Director of JIA Business Association Venue: Office of JIA Association
10:30-11:20	Meeting with Mr. Malik Abakirov, Chairperson of Guarantee Fund JSC Venue: Office of Guarantee Fund
11:20-12:20	Meeting with clients of Guarantee Fund (1-2 companies TBC) Venue: Office of Guarantee Fund
Day 5 in Kyrgyzstan: Wednesday, 29 May 2019	
08:45-09:05	Travel from hotel to Atbashi Sut LLC shop
09:10-09:50	Visit of Atbashi Sut LLC shop in Bishkek Ms. Nurilya Oruzumbekova, Director of Atbashi Sut LLC (cheese producer) Venue: Atbashi Sut LLC shop
10:10-11:40	Meeting with AFT clients from Naryn Oblast: Ms. Gulzat Abdyrasulova, Director of Free Economic Zone “Naryn” (trade support institution) Ms. Maripa Mukanova, Manager of “Shagdar” cooperative (crAFT production) Mr. Alybek Orozakunov, Chairperson of PU “Naryn Uyuk” (beekeepers association) Venue: UNDP CO

11:45-12:15	Wrap-up meeting with Ms. Aliona Niculita, Deputy Resident Representative UNDP in Kyrgyzstan Venue: UNDP CO
16.00	Departure from Airport Manas

ANNEX 9: EVALUATION MATRIX

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
Relevance					
1. Has the project strategy been relevant and appropriate to ensure the intended results?	1.1. Have the project impact and outcome contributed to the priorities outlined in UNDAF for each country and in the Regional Program Document?	1.1. The project impact and outcome contributed to the priorities outlined in UNDAF for each country and in the Regional Program Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RPD, UNDAFs ProDoc - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Semi-structured interview with UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents, as well as RPD and UNDAFs - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
	1.2. Has the method of delivery been appropriate to secure intended impacts (goals)?	1.2. The method of delivery was appropriate to secure intended impacts (goals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ProDoc, APR - Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
		1.3. AFT stakeholders had adequate capacity to effectively participate in and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
		benefit from project activities	- Observation notes	MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit	conducting semi-structured interviews with - Observe and verify during on-site visits
2. Has the project concept been in line with the national strategic and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries?	2.1. Has the method of delivery selected by the project and intended and observed outcomes been in line with the national and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries?	2.1. The method of delivery selected by the project and intended and observed outcomes were in line with the national and sector development priorities and plans of partner countries	- MGP reports ⁵¹ , ProDoc, APR, - Survey results - Interview notes	- Desk study, - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, and TSIs	- Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
	2.2. Have the perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes been considered during the project design and implementation processes?	2.2. The perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes were considered during the project design and implementation processes	- ProDoc - Survey results - Interview notes	- Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs	- Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews

⁵¹ Reports produced by MGP in partner countries

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
Effectiveness					
3. To what extent the project achieved intended outcomes and outputs?	3.1. Has the project met the component level outcome targets?	3.1. Project met the component level outcome targets (additional jobs created, higher wage bills, higher sales volume)	- ProDoc, APR, MYPR - Interview notes	- Desk study Semi-structured interview with UNDP	- Review project documents - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
	3.2. Has the project met the output targets?	3.2. The proportion of output-level targets accomplished by the project	- APR, MYPR, ProDoc	- Desk study	- Review project documents
	3.3. Have the project interventions been appropriate and effective?	3.3. The percentage of survey participating stakeholders who agreed that the project interventions had been appropriate and effective to great extent or sufficiently	- AWP, APR - MYPR, - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes	- Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit	- Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
					- Observe and verify during on-site visits
	3.4. How have the project activities and joint initiatives impacted partner organizations?	3.4. The interviewees predominantly report about positive experiences	- APR, MYPR - Interview notes - Observation notes	- Desk study - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit	- Review project documents - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
4. Can observed changes or progress be attributed towards the project?	4.1. Have the project activities and respective outputs contributed to the observed outcomes?	4.1. The project activities and respective outputs contributed to the observed outcomes	- AWP, APR, MYPR - Interview notes - Observation notes	- Desk study - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, and TSIs - Field visit	- Review project documents - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
				- Desk study	

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
	4.2. Can the observed changes in partners organizations be attributed the activities and interventions implemented by the project?	4.2. The observed changes in partner organizations can be attributed to the activities and interventions implemented by the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AWP, APR, MYPR - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardized survey, semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, TSI, and SME - Field visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results; validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
Efficiency					
5. Has the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?	5.1. Have project resources been used efficiently?	5.1. Project resources were used efficiently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - APRF, APR, AWP Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNPD, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
	5.1. Has the cost minimization strategy used by the project been effective?	5.2. The cost minimization strategy used by the project was effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - APRF, ARP - Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
				interview with UNPD, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs	- Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
Management					
6. How successful have project strategic management, planning, monitoring and evaluation, and outreach activities been?	6.1. How successful and timebound has ongoing cooperation between the UNDP IRH and country offices been?	6.1. Ongoing cooperation between the UNDP IRH and country offices was successful and timebound	Interview notes	Semi-structured interview	- Conduct semi-structured interviews
	6.2. How successful have project planning and monitoring and evaluation activities been?	6.2. Project planning and monitoring and evaluation activities were organized successfully	Interview notes	Semi-structured interview	- Conduct semi-structured interviews
	6.3. How successful have project outreach efforts been (dialogue with the government and implementing partners and engagement of stakeholders)?	6.3. Project outreach efforts were successful	Interview notes	Semi-structured interview	- Conduct semi-structured interviews
Sustainability					

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
7. Will the benefits that resulted from the project activities continue through adequate ownership and the implementation capacity of AFT stakeholders?	7.1. Have the project activities been designed with a view to passing over responsibilities to local partners?	7.1. The project activities were designed with a view to passing over responsibilities to local partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ProDoc, APR, AWP - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNPD, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
	7.2. Will the benefits of the outputs continue After the project completion?	7.2. The benefits of the outputs will continue After the project completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - APR, MYPR, AWP - Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNPD, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
	7.3. Can the capacity be maintained by AFT stakeholders?	7.3. The capacity can be maintained by AFT stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
				MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit	structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
	7.4. Are partnerships/collaborations in place between government agencies, the private sector, and SMEs to institutionalize and sustain the attained results?	7.4. Partnerships/ collaborations are in place between government agencies, the private sector, and development partners to institutionalize and sustain the attained results	- APR, MYPR, AWP - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes	- Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNPD, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit	- Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
	7.5. Has the project addressed the environmental sustainability issue?	7.6. Project addressed the environmental sustainability issue	- ProDoc, APR - Interview notes	- Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP	- Review project documents - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
Cross-cutting: gender and marginalized groups					

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
8. To what extent has the project activities contributed to gender equality?	8.1. Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?	8.1. Gender marker data assigned this project is representative of reality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ProDoc, APR - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
	8.2. Has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?	8.2. The project promoted positive changes in gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - APR, MYPR, AWP - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNPD, MGP, TSI and SME - Field visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
	8.3. Has the project contributed to UN_SWAP performance indicators?	8.3. The project contributed to UN_SWAP performance indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UN-SWAP, APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
	8.4. Have the project activities contributed to new jobs and higher wages for women, as well as promoted sales in women-owned SMEs?	8.4. The project activities contributed to new jobs and higher wages for women, as well as promoted sales in women-owned SMEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - APR, MYPR, AWP - Survey results - Interview notes - Observation notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with SMEs - Field visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits
9. Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	9.1. Have people with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project?	9.1. People with disabilities and other marginalized groups benefited from the work of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ProDoc, APR, MYPR - Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with UNDP, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial findings by conducting semi-structured interviews
10. Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment	10.1. Have supported subsectors in targeted countries provided additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship?	10.1. Supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AWP, APR - MYPR, - Survey results - Interview notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk study - Standardized survey - Semi-structured interview with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents - Analyze survey results - Validate and clarify initial

Key questions	Specific sub-question	Indicator	Data Source	Data collection methods	Data collection procedure
and entrepreneurship? ⁵²		and entrepreneurship	- Observation notes	UNDP, MGP, TSIs, and SMEs - Field visit	findings by conducting semi-structured interviews - Observe and verify during on-site visits

⁵² “The overall goal (impact) of the project is: ‘By 2017, supported subsectors in targeted countries provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship’”, ProDoc, page 6

ANNEX 10: SURVEY RESULTS ON PROJECT RELEVANCE⁵³

Survey question	Responses	Uzbekistan	Tajikistan	Kyrgyzstan
To what extent was the referenced method of delivery appropriate to provide additional opportunities for decent employment and entrepreneurship in your country?	Very appropriate	89 %	38 %	64 %
	Appropriate	11 %	56 %	29 %
	Somewhat appropriate	0 %	6 %	7 %
	Not appropriate	0 %	0 %	0 %
The project focused on expanding processing and trade of agriproducts. To what extent is this approach in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of your country?	Very appropriate	83 %	44%	57 %
	Appropriate	17 %	44%	43 %
	Somewhat appropriate	0 %	13 %	0 %
	Not appropriate	0 %	0 %	0 %
The main target of the project was to increase sales volumes, generate new jobs and higher wages, specifically, in SME operating in the regions. To what extent is this approach in line with the national development priorities of your country?	Very appropriate	76 %	63 %	64 %
	Appropriate	24 %	19 %	36 %
	Somewhat appropriate	0 %	19 %	0 %
	Not appropriate	0 %	0 %	0 %
Has your organization had adequate capacity to effectively participate in and benefit from project activities?	Very appropriate	72 %	44 %	65 %
	Appropriate	28 %	44 %	35 %
	Somewhat appropriate	0 %	13 %	0 %
	Not appropriate	0 %	0 %	0 %
To what extent has your organization supported the long-term objectives of the project - increased employment and entrepreneurship opportunities (including for women)?	Very appropriate	39 %	50 %	65 %
	Appropriate	55 %	50 %	35 %
	Somewhat appropriate	6 %	0 %	0 %
	Not appropriate	0 %	0 %	0 %
To what extent were the perspectives of your organization or other Government agencies, industry/business associations and other stakeholders considered during the project design process and implementation?	Very appropriate	50 %	38 %	38 %
	Appropriate	50 %	50 %	57 %
	Somewhat appropriate	0 %	6 %	0 %
	Not appropriate	0 %	0 %	0 %

⁵³ Assessment was conducted among MGPs and TSIs