

**Annex A: Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators**

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY*	RATING**
<b>Objective :</b> To strengthen capacity to use environmental learning and stakeholder involvement as tools to address natural resource management issues as part of poverty reduction.	Use of EE, EL and SI to address NRM and poverty issues by the State Committee on Environmental Protection	Diverse and high quality EE/EL and SI programmes and activities planned or underway to address NRM and poverty issues		S
	Citizens involvement in decision-making to address NRM and poverty issues	Stakeholders involved in implementing NRM programmes and projects Decision-making processes revised to encourage stakeholder involvement and institutionalized within the NRM framework		S
	Public access to environmental information	2 brochures and 1 web site on environmental information available to the public		HS
	Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 6 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 9 of 12</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 4 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 6 of 6</li> </ul> (total targeted score: 30/42)	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 5 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 6 of 12</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 3 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 5 of 6</li> </ul> (total targeted score: 24 /42)	MS
OUTCOMES		END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education/learning and stakeholder involvement as natural resource management tools.	A revised State Programme for EE and EL integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions' obligations	A revised State programme addressing Rio and Aarhus Conventions' obligations		S
	Adequate legislation for EE, EL, SI and AEI in place	Decision-making processes revised, including SI and AEI and introduced in legislation related to NRM		S
	Adequate institutional set-up with clear mandate to carry out EE, EL, SI and provide AEI.	Institutions with clear mandates and assigned responsibilities to implement the State Programme on EE and EL.		S
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Number of systematically implemented EL activities	7 EL programmes being systematically implemented by government institutions and civil society organizations		S
	Quantity and quality of EE, EL and SI materials and delivery mechanisms	5 materials adapted to the Tajik context Training Centre established Some specific training modules established		HS

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY*	RATING**
	Number of participants trained in EE, EL and SI using the module developed by the project	500 people trained (civil servants, teachers, NGO staff, etc.)		HS
<b>Outcome 3:</b>	Increased use of community EL techniques by local governments in programmes and projects to address NRM and poverty reduction at the local level	Local governments in the four selected Jamoats are using EL as a tool to involve communities to address NRM issues		S
	A community EL Kit adopted and disseminated in Tajikistan	EL kit finalized and disseminated in Tajikistan at the district level		S
	Community EL incorporated into JRCs' terms of references, strategies and programmes	JRCs in pilot districts (4) have integrated community EL into their programming and activities; including the Revolving Funds		S
		Other JRCs in Tajikistan have adopted the same approach	The approach is being integrated in a few JRCs established within the framework of other UNDP projects i.e. Poverty and Environment of the Communities Programme	<u>MS</u>
<b>Outcome 4:</b>	Project management consistent with UNDP and GEF standards	UNDP and GEF standards used consistently by the project management team		HS
	Good practices and lessons learned packaged as knowledge products and disseminated through national and international networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good practises and lessons learned are packaged into knowledge products and they are easily accessible and are accessed by relevant stakeholders and by the general public at large</li> </ul>	The knowledge product is being used for other GEF funded projects within a new established UNDP Energy and Environment Programme	MS

\* *Status of delivery colouring codes:*  
Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement  
Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project  
Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

\*\* Rating:  
**Highly Satisfactory = HS**  
Satisfactory = S  
Marginally Satisfactory = MS  
Unsatisfactory = U

## Annex B: Project Ratings

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE						RATING
	HU	U	MU	MS	S	HS	
<b>PROJECT FORMULATION</b>							
Conceptualization/Design					√		
Stakeholder participation						√	
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>							
Implementation Approach					√		
The use of the logical framework					√		
Adaptive management					√		
Use/establishment of information technologies					√		
Operational relationships between the institutions involved					√		
Technical capacities					√		
Monitoring and evaluation					√		
Stakeholder participation					√		
Production and dissemination of information						√	
Local resource users and NGOs participation					√		
Establishment of partnerships						√	
Involvement and support of governmental institutions					√		
<b>PROJECT RESULTS</b>							
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives							
Achievement of objective					√		
Outcome 1					√		
Outcome 2					√		
Outcome 3					√		
Outcome 4					√		
<b>OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT &amp; IMPACT</b>					√		

Annex C: Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard (as of March, 2012)

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score 2012	2011	2010	2009	Comments	Next Steps	Outcome Contribution
CR 1: Capacities for engagement									
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental education organizations	Institutional responsibilities for environmental education are not clearly defined	0	2				Draft SPEEL completed and undergoing review for finalization & subsequent implementation. Coordination mechanisms and implementation responsibilities in place.		1, 2
	Institutional responsibilities for environmental education are identified	1							
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental education are partially recognized by stakeholders	2			1	0			
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental education recognized by stakeholders	3							
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0	1				More organizations are involved in environmental education; but lack co-management mechanisms		1
	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1							
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2			1	1			
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional	3							
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0	2				Stakeholder Involvement has improved through the partnerships implemented, the working groups and the JRCs		1, 3
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1			1	0			
	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2							
	Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes	3							
Total score for CR1			5	5	3	1			

Capacity Result / Indicator		Staged Indicators	Rating	Score 2012	2011	2010	2009	Comments	Next Steps	Outcome Contribution
					CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge					
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs) <sup>1</sup>	0	2		1	1	Increased knowledge about global environmental issues but still clear path for the way forward. has yet been established		2, 3	
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs)	1								
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2								
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3								
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	0	2				Much sharing of environmental information has been taking place but much more needs to happen		1, 2	
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1								
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	2			2	1				
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	3								
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	No environmental education programmes are in place	0	1				Environmental education programmes relating to the Rio Conventions exist but still only partially delivered. In the school system, EE is being introduced on a phased basis. At the TTU enrolment in Ecology Department is increasing.		1, 2, 3	
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1			1	1				
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2								
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3								

<sup>1</sup> Multilateral environmental agreements

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score 2012	2011	2010	2009	Comments	Next Steps	Outcome Contribution
Indicator 7 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes	0	n/a		n/a	n/a			n/a
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes	1							
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2							
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3							
Indicator 8 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0	1				Issue of integrated local knowledge into environmental decision-making remains.		2, 3
	Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes	1			1	0			
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2							
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3							
Total score for CR2			6	6	5	3			
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development									
Indicator 9 – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental education plans and strategies	0	2				The State Programme in environmental education has been revised but not yet being implemented		1, 2
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental education plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used	1							
	Adequate environmental education plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding	2			2	1			

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score 2012	2011	2010	2009	Comments	Next Steps	Outcome Contribution
	constraints and/or other problems								
	The environmental education planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3							
<b>Indicator 10</b> – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0	<b>2</b>		1	1	New EE law passed. Next phase will be to focus on the implementation of this revised EE legislation framework		<b>1, 2</b>
	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1							
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	2							
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	3							
<b>Indicator 11</b> – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0	<b>1</b>				Environmental information has becomes more available but it is not relevant enough to support all environmental decision-making process.		<b>2, 3</b>
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1							
	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2			1	0			
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3							
<b>Total score for CR3</b>			<b>5</b>	4	4	2			
<b>CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation</b>									
<b>Indicator 12</b> – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0	<b>2</b>				More resources for environmental education are being made available to relevant organizations.		<b>1, 3</b>
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1			1	0			

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score 2012	2011	2010	2009	Comments	Next Steps	Outcome Contribution
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2							
	Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3							
<b>Indicator 13 –</b> Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified	0	<b>1</b>		1	1	The project supports the development of related skills and knowledge.		<b>2, 3</b>
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1							
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2							
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	3							
<b>Total score for CR4</b>			<b>3</b>	4	2	1			
<b>CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate</b>									
<b>Indicator 14 –</b> Adequacy of the project monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme	0	<b>3</b>				A well laid out monitoring plan exists to monitor the project progress.		<b>4</b>
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1							
	Regular participative monitoring of results is being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2			2	2			
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3							
<b>Indicator 15 –</b> Adequacy of the project evaluation process	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources	0	<b>2</b>				In-depth reviews done by the CTA and Project management Team during different stages of the project allowed for by-passing of a Mid-term evaluation (though optional) Terminal evaluation completed.		<b>4</b>
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1							



Capacity Result / Indicator		Staged Indicators	Rating	Score 2012	2011	2010	2009	Comments	Next Steps	Outcome Contribution
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2			2	2				
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team	3								
Total score for CR5				5	4	4	4			
Combined total score for CR1-CR5				24	23	18	11			

Annex D: Stakeholders consulted during preparation of the CB-2 MSP proposal

Stakeholders consulted during preparation of the CB-2 MSP proposal	
Name	Position
1. Gulmakhmadov D.	Head of State Committee of Republic of Tajikistan for Land Management, Focal Point of National Action Program to Combat Desertification
2. Karimov A.	Head of State Committee for Environment Protection and Forestry, GEF Political and Operational Focal Point
3. Rakhmonov A.	Minister of Education
4. Khaqdodov M.	Deputy of Minister of Industry, NCSA National Focal Point
5. Safarov N.	Director of National Centre on biodiversity and biosafety, National Focal Point on Biodiversity Conservation and Biosafety
6. Makhmadaliev B.	Head of Agency on Hydrometeorology, National Focal Point on Climate Change
7. Khoshmuhamedov S.	UNDP, Assistant Resident Representative/Programme
8. Mahmoudov A.	UNDP Communities Program, Program Manager
9. Kayumov A.	Specialist of the Centre on Climate Change, National Consultant
10. Kobuliev Z.	Senior lecturer of the Ecology Department of Tajik Technical University, National Consultant
11. Boturov K.	Head of Department of State Committee for Environment Protection and Forestry, Director of Aarhus/Orphus Centre
12. Nazarov T.	Head of Department of State Committee for Environment Protection and Forestry,
13. Smylys S.	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Environmental Officer
14. Maria Melbring, Ilhom Akobirshoev	Swedish International. Development Agency, Programme Officer
15. Michael Bowles	Mountain Societies Development Support Program (Aga Khan Foundation Project), Manager of Policy and Evaluation Unit
16. Nadiradze N.	CARE (Int. NGO, USA), Project Director
17. Andrew Wilson, Umida Tulieva	Act Central Asia (Int. NGO, UK), Country Representative
18. Kargasov G.	Central Asian Mountain Partnership Program (Int. NGO, Switzerland), Project Coordinator
19. Kargasov, Guldast	CAMP, Central Asian Mountain Partnership (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation project)
19. Boboeva Z.	Save the Children (Int. NGO, USA/U.K.), Project Manager
20. Latifi A.	Central Asian Regional Environmental Center, Branch Director
21. Skochilov Yu.	Head of local NGO “Youth Ecological Centre”
22. Dadobaev Kh.	Head of local NGO “Zumrad”
23. Burhanova M.	Head of local NGO “Foundation on Civil Initiatives Support”
24. Blagoveshenskaya S.	Program officer of local NGO “Kuhiston Foundation”
25. Pachadjanov D.	Director of local NGO “Kuhiston Foundation”

ProDoc

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	2012	TOTAL
GEF	\$114,000	\$194,500	\$161,500		\$470,000
UNDP (in-cash)	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000		\$40,000
UNDP (in-kind)	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		\$300,000
Communities	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$20,000
Government	30,000	40,000	40,000		110,000
TOTAL	\$244,000	\$364,500	\$331,500		\$940,000

Actuals

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	2012	TOTAL
GEF	\$ 98,390.82	\$ 169,263.13	\$ 157,775.75	\$ 47,500.00	\$472,929.70
UNDP (in-cash)	\$ -	\$ 16,680.58	\$ 101,109.53	\$ 25,000.00	\$142,790.11
UNDP (in-kind)					
Communities					
Government					
TOTAL	\$98,391	\$185,944	\$258,885	\$72,500	\$615,719.81

ANNEX : F : CO- FINANCING SOURCES FOR EE & EL PROJECT

Co financing Sources for EE & El project	UNDP		Government		Communities		GEF		Total	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant	40,000.00	\$ 142,790.11					470,000.00	472,929.70	510,000.00	615,719.81
In-kind *	300,000.00	300,000.00	110,000.00	74,000.00	20,000.00	22,500.00			430,000.00	396,500.00
Other Types									0.00	0.00
TOTAL	340,000.000	442,790.11	110,000.000	74,000.000	20,000.000	22,500.000	470,000.000	472,929.70	940,000.000	1,012,219.81

Annex G: Contribution of the G0T, SCEP, Ministry of Education and ICST

<b>Contribution of the GoT (CEP, Min of Education and ICST)</b>				
<b>CEP</b>				
Office premises	Month	17	1500	25500
Information Resource Center at the CEP (repair and partially equipment)	unit	1	15000	15000
<b>MinEducation</b>				
Repair of the Center at Teachers Retraining Institute	unit	1	5000	5000
Allocation of Premises for Resource Center	month	25	500	12500
<b>ICST</b>				
Repair of the Department for Environmental Learning		1	6500	6500
Allocation of Premises for Env Learning Department		19	500	9500
<b>Total:</b>				<b>74000</b>
<b>Contribution of Communities</b>				
Jamoat Resource Centers (maintenance, repair, supplies, etc)	month	30	750	22500
<b>Total:</b>				<b>22500</b>

Annex H: Key Stakeholders for the CB2 Project

Key Stakeholders for the CB-2 Project	
Stakeholder	Role in Project
<b>Government</b>	
State Committee for Environment and Forest Protection (SCEFP)	National Executing Agency
State Committee for Land Management (SCLM)	Partner Agency
Ministry of Education	Partner Agency
District and Local (Jamoat) Environmental Committees (offices of SCEFP) & equivalent committees for SCLM	Partners for design and delivery /beneficiaries
Civil Servant Training Institute	Partner Agency
Academy of Pedagogical Sciences/ Teacher Training Institute	Partner Agency
Aarhus/ Orkhus Centre (access to environmental information and public involvement)	Advisors
GEF and Rio Convention Focal Points	Advisors
Centre on Climate Change	Advisors

Key Stakeholders for the CB-2 Project	
Centre on Biodiversity and Biosafety	Advisors
Centre for Land Degradation	Advisors
<b>National NGOs</b>	
Youth 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Partner Agency for training of JRCs
<b>Community-based Organisations</b>	
Jamoat Resource Centres	Partners for design and delivery /beneficiaries
<b>Academic/Research Institutions</b>	
All	Provide expertise; deliver and receive training
<b>International NGOs</b>	
Central Asian Mountain Partnership Program CAMP (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation)	Consultation: lessons learned in working with communities
Save the Children (USA/U.K.)	Consultation: lessons learned in working with communities and teacher training (Possible partner in delivery)
<b>Multi and Bilateral Donors</b>	
UNDP Communities Program	Co-financing, Partner in delivery

Annex I: Implementation Phases

Phase I (year 1)	Phase II (year 2)	Phase III (year 3)
<p><b>Assessment Phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess existing frameworks for EE/EL: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutions</li> <li>Policies and programmes</li> <li>Legislation</li> <li>Primary/Secondary curricula</li> <li>Higher education programmes/courses</li> </ul> </li> <li>Attitudes and perceptions of communities on environment and its management Existing monitoring system</li> </ul>	<p><b>Gap Analysis Phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize assessments</li> <li>Gaps analysis</li> <li>Proposals/recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislative agenda</li> <li>Programme/policy</li> <li>Training curricula</li> <li>Community EL Kit</li> </ul> </li> <li>Start Implementation of approved proposals/ recommendations</li> <li>Training programmes for public servants and teachers</li> <li>Delivery of training to public servants, teachers and community leaders</li> </ul>	<p><b>Implementation Phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of approved proposals/ recommendations</li> <li>Development of training curricula</li> <li>Delivery of training activities for public servants (IPA), teachers (Centre for Advance Courses for Teachers) and community leaders (JRCs)</li> <li>Publication of best practices</li> </ul>

#### **Annex J: List of documents reviewed**

- Project Document “Environmental Learning and Stakeholder Involvement as Tools for Global Environmental Benefits and Poverty Reduction”
- Project Logframe
- Annual Workplans
- GEF capacity Development Scorecard
- Project Inception Report 2009
- Steering Committee Minutes
- Annual Project Reports 2009, 2010 and 2011
- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports 2009, 2010, and 2011
- Quarterly Progress Monitoring Matrices 2011
- Environmental Learning Department Charter
- Foreword to the module of the training for the Institute of Civil Servants (Niyozov)
- Foreword to the training guidebook module “Man and Nature” on United Nations Conventions on Environment Protection and Sustainable Development for the teachers of the high vocational educational institutions.
- Training Modules 1 and 2 for the ICST
- Gulahmado, H & Boev, R. Brief information on the training guidebook on Ecological Education and Learning in the Framework Convention on Biodiversity
- Haqdodov, M.M.Final report on the assessment of existing laws, policies and regulations in the Republic of Tajikistan in the field of ecology.
- Micro-loan fund (Imdodi Rushd) presentation
- Presentation – Youth 21<sup>st</sup> Century.
- 

#### **Annex K: List of Persons consulted**

1	Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov	UNDP, AAR Program
2	Mirzohaydar Isoev	Energy and Environment Program Analyst
3	Nargiza Usmanova	Program Analyst, UNDP
4	Kiyomiddin Davlatov	Local Adviser on Eco-education
5	Firuz Ibrohimov	Manager of CACILM Project
6	Oikhon Sharifova	National Project Coordinator, Deputy Chairman of the SCEP
7	Farhod Rahimov	Deputy Minister of Education/ The UNDP- MinEd subproject Coordinator
8	Zemfira Lablavunova	Ministry of Education/ the UNDP- MinEd subproject staff
9	Latofat Nazirova	Director of the Teacher Re-training Institute
10	Abdurozic Kholikov	Head of the Nature and Physics Department, Teacher Re-training Institute
11	Mahbuba Maksudova	Head of the Education Department, Teacher Re-training Institute
12	Habibullo Boboev	Head of the International Affairs Department, Teacher Re-training Institute
13	Homidkhon Nuriddinov	Science and Studies Pro-rector, Institute for Civil Servants Training\UNDP-ICST Subproject Coordinator
14	Kosimsho Iskandarov	Director of the State Management and Civil Servants Research Center, Institute for Civil Servants Training/ UNDP-ICST Subproject Coordinator
15	Timur Yunusov	Executive Director of the NGO “Youth of 21st Century” (JRC environmental education capacity building subproject
16	Suhrob Nuriddinov	Trainer, NGO “Youth of 21st Century”
17	Umed Ulugov	Chief accountant, NGO “Youth of 21st Century”
18	Rozia Alieva	Central Asian Mountainous Program (CAMP “Kuhiston”)
19	Talbak Salimov	Chairman of the Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP)
20	Mahmadsharif Haqdodov	Member of the Environmental Commission of the Lower Chamber of the Parliament
21	Jean –Joseph Bellamy	CTA for the Environment Learning Project
22	Haidar Gulahmadov	Tajik Technical University (TTU), Environmental Training Department manager/ UNDP-TTU subproject Coordinator
23	Zokir Rahmonov	Director of the Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”
24	Timur Yusupov	Credit Manager, Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”
25	Rahimjon Shamsudinov	Senior Accountant, Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”
	Madina Abdunazarova	Cashier, Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”
	Haydarjon Abrorov Credit specialist, Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”	Credit specialist, Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”
	Jamilya Yunusova	Credit expert, Micro-Loan Foundation “Imdodi Rushd”
	Muhabbat Qamarova	National Environmental Officer, OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe)
	Firuza Hoshimova	Assistant National Environmental Officer, OSCE
	Gulshan Karimova	Chairman of ‘Sabo’ Jamoat Resource Center
	Parviz Latypov	Teacher of the Secondary School #18 of ‘Sabo’ Jamoat
	Jamshed Khudoyberdiev	Head of the formation of the Emergency Situations Committee in Gissar District
	Khurshed Kholov	Coordinator of the GEF Small Grants Program



	Quvvat Murodov	Chairman of the ‘Romit’ Jamoat Resource Center
	Jurabek Nazirov	Loan Officer\cassier, ‘Imdodi Rushd’ Micro-Loan Fund
	Hamoidin Mahmudov	Director of ‘Romit’ Protected Area

Annex L

Highly Satisfactory (HS):

Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.

Satisfactory (S):

Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.

Marginally Satisfactory (MS):

Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.

Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):

Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives

Unsatisfactory (U):

Project is expected **not** to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

Highly Unsatisfactory (U):

The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Annex M: Terms of Reference



TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GEF Project:

PIMS 3514 - “Environmental Learning and Stakeholder Involvement as Tools for Global Environmental Benefits and Poverty Reduction”

Contents

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	19
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	19
3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION.....	20
4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION .....	21
5. EVALUATION APPROACH .....	22
6. DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM .....	23
7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.....	24
8. APPLICATION PROCESS .....	24
Annex 1. Revised Logical Framework and Project Performance Indicators.....	24
Annex 2a. Evaluation Report: Sample Outline.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 2b. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 3. Co-financing Table .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 4. Rate tables .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluation Team.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 6. Cost breakdown template .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Project Title:	<b>Environmental Learning and Stakeholder Involvement as Tools for Global Environmental Benefits and Poverty Reduction, PIMS 3514</b>
Functional Titles:	International Evaluator / Team Leader National Expert
Duration:	Estimated 20 working days Over the period of: November 2011 – January 2012
Terms of Payment:	Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report
Travel costs:	The costs of in-country mission(s) of the consultant are to be included in the lump sum.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

The Final Evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global and national environmental goals. The Final Evaluation also identifies/documents lessons learned and makes recommendations that project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related projects and programs.

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”(see <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>).

This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the level of regulatory bodies of the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, and UNDP/GEF) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and with a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

**2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Summary: The CB-2 (Capacity Building 2) project “Environmental Learning and Stakeholder Involvement as Tools for Global Environmental Benefits and Poverty Reduction” aims to expand Tajikistan’s capacity to generate global environmental benefits through educating and involving diverse stakeholders in addressing Rio Convention themes at national and local levels. The project will build capacity to use two key environmental management tools to implement the Rio Conventions and to reduce poverty. The first is “*environmental learning*” (EL) which, according to the Tajik Government’s approach, includes both formal *environmental education* (EE) in schools and informal *environmental learning* (EL) for all sectors of society. The second is “*stakeholder involvement*” (SI) which includes public awareness, consultation and participation. The project strategy has three components: (1) Enhance the enabling environment for using EE/EL and SI through modifying legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks; (2) Improve organisational and individual capacity to implement EE/EL and SI programmes and to integrate environmental learning and involvement activities into other programmes and projects; and (3) Enhance local capacity to link local and global issues, and natural resources management (NRM) and poverty reduction, through action projects based on a model and techniques for “*Community Environmental Learning*” (CEL).

Background: Tajikistan has a population of 6,438,000 with 40% under the age of 14 and over 70% of the population is still rural. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and independence in 1991, the country experienced civil war through to 1996. The war, economic contraction, and the loss of social services led to a dramatic deterioration in living conditions, especially in rural areas. The country began recovery after a peace agreement in 1998 and has achieved considerable economic success. GDP growth has been steady over the last seven years, with an average rate of 10 percent for the past four years. Despite this, the country remains among the poorest and most fragile of the CIS countries. Tajikistan was one of the poorest of the Soviet republics and is still considered “low-income”, with widespread poverty, especially in rural areas. An increase in natural disasters, often exacerbated by human factors (deforestation, poor land management, building on slopes), has further impaired the country's infrastructure and productive capacity. Local people are highly dependent on natural resources for food, fuel and construction, imposing increasing pressure on forests, land, water and biological diversity for their livelihoods.

The project design is based on the NCSA (2003-2005), which analysed the cross-cutting capacity constraints preventing Tajikistan from making a greater contribution to global environmental management. The Final NCSA Report and Action Plan identified “*Public involvement and participation, awareness and environmental education*” as one of the five highest priority topics for capacity development. It also identified 12 key actions, five of which are addressed by the project, including public awareness/environmental education; public participation; increased role for local governing bodies; integration of poverty reduction and environmental protection; and better inter-agency coordination.

Goal: The aim of this project is to expand Tajikistan’s capacity to generate global environmental benefits through educating and involving diverse stakeholders in addressing Rio Convention themes at national and local levels. The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity to use environmental learning and stakeholder involvement as tools to address natural resource management issues as part of poverty reduction.

This objective will be reached through three main outcomes:

- (i) Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education/learning and stakeholder involvement as natural resource management tools;
- (ii) Improved capacity of government and civil society to integrate environmental learning and stakeholder involvement into programmes and projects; and
- (iii) Enhanced capacity of local government and community organizations to use community environmental learning and involvement as tools for natural resource management and poverty reduction.

The GEF capacity development monitoring scorecard was completed during the inception phase with a total score of 11 out of 42, indicating at the time (early 2009) a low capacity in place for an effective environmental education managerial system.

From the point of view of the design and implementation of the project, the key stakeholders are / were:

- State Committee for Environmental Protection (SCEP)
- Ministry of Education
- Academy of Pedagogical Sciences/ Teacher Training Institute
- Institute Civil Service Training (ICST)
- Parliament of Tajikistan
- Local (Jamoat) Environmental Committees in four (4) demonstration areas
- Aarhus Centre (access to environmental information and public involvement)
- GEF and Rio Convention Focal Points
- UNDP Country Office
- UNDP/GEF Regional Center for Europe and CIS (Bratislava)
- The GEF Secretariat, who is not involved in project implementation, but to whom the Terminal Evaluation Report to be prepared under this Terms of Reference will be submitted.

The Project Document was signed between the Ministry of Agriculture and Nature Protection and UNDP Country Office in September 2008. The Project was originally planned for three years (September 2008 to September 2011) but a “no-cost” extension of 6 months was approved in 2011.

Three project outcomes are defined in the Project Document and reviewed in the Inception Report:

1.	Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education/learning and stakeholder involvement as natural resource management tools.
2.	Improved capacity of government and civil society to integrate environmental learning and stakeholder involvement into programmes and projects.
3.	Enhanced capacity of local government and community organizations to use community environmental learning and involvement as tools for natural resource management and poverty reduction.

Associated with these outcomes there are a number of Outputs (please see [Annex 1](#) for the Revised Logical Framework of the project). Progress towards them is reported in the 2011 Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) (will be available to the Evaluation Team).

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The objective of the Evaluation is to assess the achievement of project objective, the affecting factors, the broader project impact and the contribution to the general goal/strategy, and the project partnership strategy.

Project success will be measured based on Revised Project Logical Framework (see [Annex 1](#)), which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation will assess the aspects as listed in evaluation report outline attached in [Annex 2](#).

The Evaluation will focus on the following aspects:

- **Project design and its relevance** in relation to:
  - a) *Development priorities* at the national level;
  - b) *Stakeholders* – assess if the specific needs were met;
  - c) *Country ownership / drivenness* – participation and commitments of government, local authorities, public services, utilities, residents;
  - d) *UNDP mission to promote sustainable human development (SHD)* by assisting the country to build its capacities in the focal area of environmental protection and management;
- **Performance** - look at the progress that has been made by the project relative to the achievement of its objective and outcomes;
  - a) *Effectiveness* - extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and the desired outcomes, and the overall contribution of the project to national strategic objectives;
  - b) *Efficiency* - assess efficiency against overall impact of the project for better projection of achievements and benefits resulting from project resources, including an assessment of the different implementation modalities and the cost effectiveness of the utilisation of GEF resources and actual co-financing for the achievement of project results;
  - c) *Timeliness* of results,
- **Management arrangements** focused on project implementation:
  - a) *General implementation and management* - evaluate the adequacy of the project, implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the UNDP Country Office, the partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to UNDP/GEF requirements and also from the perspective of “good (or bad) practice model” that could be used for replication / learn useful lessons.
  - b) *Financial accountability* – extent to which the sound financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems and adjustment of activities, budgets and inputs

- c) *Monitoring and evaluation on project level* – assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation, and its internalization by competent authorities and service providers after the completion of the project; focusing to relevance of the performance indicators, that are:
  - **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective and only that objective.
  - **Measurable:** The monitoring system and indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what it covers and there are practical ways to measure it.
  - **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
  - **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
  - **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of particular stakeholders group to be impacted by the project.
- **Overall success** of the project with regard to the following criteria:
  - a) *Impact* - assessment of results with reference to development objectives of the project and the achievement of global environmental goals, positive or negative, intended or unintended changes brought about by the project intervention (any changes in legal or regulatory environment that improved opportunities for Environmental Education (EE), Environmental Learning (EL) and Stakeholder Involvement (SI), impact on capacity of institutions involved in implementing EE, EL and SI initiatives, impact on commitment of local authorities and communities to use EE, EL and SI as tools for Natural Resource Management (NRM), and impact on NRM practices);
  - e) *Global environmental benefits* – through educating and involving diverse national and local stakeholders in addressing Rio Convention themes;
  - b) *Sustainability* - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project, *static sustainability* which refers to the continuous flow of the same benefits to the same target groups; *dynamic sustainability* use and/or adaptation of the projects' results by original target groups and/or other target groups. It should include a comparison of the baseline assessment of the CD Scorecard with the terminal assessment, and make some inferences as to what contribution(s) the project has made towards institutionalizing the capacities developed;
  - c) *Contribution to capacity development* - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions (municipalities) to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects' results;
  - d) *Replication* – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region, outlining of possible funding sources; replication to date without direct intervention of the project;
  - e) *Synergies* with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

In addition to a descriptive assessment, **criteria should be rated** using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory with an explanation of the rating. Also the Overall Rating of the project should be indicated. Criteria, which have to be rated are indicated in the evaluation report outline attached in [Annex 2](#).

#### **Issues of special consideration:**

The Evaluation will review and assess changes in development conditions, by addressing the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

- Has there been any change in the legal and regulatory framework for Environmental Education (EE), Environmental Learning (EL), and Stakeholder Involvement (SI)?
- Has there been any change in the perception and understanding of SCEP staff, and parliamentarians on mechanisms and approaches for using EE, EL and SI as tools to better manage natural resources in Tajikistan?
- Have there been changes in the understanding and knowledge of EE, EL and SI as tools to address Natural Resource Management (NRM) issues in the context of Tajikistan's national development?
- Has the project provided a sustainable mechanism for applying EE, EL and SI as tools for NRM? Were the approaches used institutionally and technically appropriate for Tajikistan?
- Have there been changes in the perception and attitude of local authorities and local communities in the project demonstration area regarding the use of EE, EL and SI as tools to address NRM issues?
- Have there been changes in local stakeholder behaviour (i.e. threats, land use management practices...) to address NRM issues? If not, why not?
- Has the project provided any basis for the long-term sustainability of project outcomes? In what way(s)?
- What are the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence project achievements, especially changes of government counterpart personnel, and the wider economic and political development context of Tajikistan? What were the project's management measures put in place to mitigate these factors?
- To what extent did the project support the development of sustainable capacities?
- Using results of the CD scorecard over the life of the project (inception (baseline), mid-point and final), assess how the progress made in developing capacities to use EE, EL and SI to address NRM issues in Tajikistan will be sustained over the long-term.

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP and/or the Government, highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

#### **4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION**

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, follow minimum GEF requirements as indicated in [Annex 2](#).

The Report of the Final Evaluation will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to the UNDP and the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The Report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project, according the table attached in [Annex 3](#) of this TOR

The Report will be supplemented by Rate Tables, attached in [Annex 4](#) of this TOR.

The length of the final evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

## 5. EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards. They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The evaluation will take place mainly in the field. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, UNDP CO, Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders.

The Evaluation Team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document (“prodoc”), project reports – incl. Annual Reports, project budget revision, progress reports, CTA mission reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, GEF Capacity Development scores from inception to end of project, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. The Final GEF Capacity Development Scorecard should be commented by the evaluation team and finalized after incorporating her/his comments. The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in [Annex 5](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The Evaluation Team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. S/He is also expected to visit the project sites.

The methodology to be used by the Evaluation Team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- ♣ Documentation reviewed;
- ♣ Interviews;
- ♣ Field visits;
- ♣ Questionnaires;
- ♣ GEF CD Scorecard completed at the time of FE (by the Evaluation Team)
- ♣ Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

*Although the Evaluation Team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.*

The Evaluation Team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

## 6. DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

### International Evaluator

#### Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline (maximum 4-day homework);
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report (1 day);
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (maximum 3 days);
- Field visit to the pilot project site, interviews (2 days);
- Complete the final CD scorecard<sup>2</sup>;
- Debriefing with UNDP (1 day);
- Development and submission of the first TE report draft (maximum of 4 days). Submission is due on the 16-th day of the assignment. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (maximum 5 days);
- Supervision of the work of the national expert (during entire evaluation period).

#### Required Qualifications:

- Master's degree in Natural Resource Management, Environmental Education/Environmental Learning, Environmental Economics or other related areas;
- 7 years of working experience in providing environmental management or environmental consultancy services; particularly to environmental education, environmental learning and stakeholder involvement projects;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating capacity development projects, particularly in the environmental education, environmental learning and stakeholder involvement areas for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project);
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based management policies and procedures;
- Recognized expertise in the environmental education, environmental learning and stakeholder involvement fields;
- Familiarity with environmental education, environmental learning and stakeholder involvement legislation, policies and management structures in CIS would be an asset;
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- Fluent in English both written and spoken;
- Fluency in Russian will be considered an asset;
- Computer literacy.

### National Consultant

#### Duties and Responsibilities

- Collection of background materials upon request by TE Team Leader/International Consultant;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans and TE report outlines;
- Desk review of materials;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the TE Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders; provide both oral and written translation from/to English/Russian/Tajik, whenever necessary;
- Field visit and assistance to the TE Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the TE Team Leader in developing the first draft of the TE report;
- Assistance to the TE Team Leader in finalization of the Final Terminal Evaluation report.

The National Consultant will assist the International Evaluator with the oral and written translation between English and Russian/Tajik as required. The National Consultant will work closely with the International Consultant and coordinate all activities with the responsible staff of the Energy and Environment Programme of UNDP Tajikistan, Programme Unit of the UNDP Country Office. Travels are also planned in the due course to the project sites throughout the country.

#### Required Qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in social sciences or other related field. Postgraduate degree(s) will be an advantage;
- Minimum 3 years of relevant experience, preferably in the field of environmental education/environmental learning and/or stakeholder involvement;
- Previous experience with the development projects implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Participation in the similar evaluations in the past is a strong advantage;
- Proven analytical skills;
- Good interpersonal, communication, facilitation and presentation skills;
- Fluency in English, Russian and Tajik both written and spoken is essential;
- Computer literacy.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that it should also include the rating of indicator #7 that was not considered at inception. A rating should be given for this indicator as well as a "reconstructed" value at inception to be able to compare both values at inception and at the end of the project.

7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Tajikistan. UNDP CO will contract the Evaluation Team. UNDP and the UNDP’s Energy and Environment Programme (UNDP EEP) will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team to provide the project documentation, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government counterparts, etc.

The evaluation will be conducted within the period of **November – December 2011**.

The activity and tentative timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Timing	Estimated duration
Desk review	November 2011	2 days
Briefings for Evaluation Team by UNDP CO and UNDP EEP	Till 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2011	1 day
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings, presentation of main findings	Between December 1 <sup>st</sup> and 30 <sup>th</sup>	10 days
Drafting of the evaluation report	Within 10 working days after the mission	3 days
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms	Till 15 <sup>th</sup> January 2012	2 days
Finalization of the terminal evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	Till 30 <sup>th</sup> January 2012	2 days
Total Effort:		20 days

The report (draft and final version) shall be submitted to the UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan.

Prior to approval of the final report, UNDP contact person will circulate the draft for comments to government counterparts and project management: UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan, UNDP’s Energy and Environment Programme, National Project Coordinator, Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, UNDP/GEF RTA.

UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions **within 10 working days after receiving the draft**.

The finalised Terminal Evaluation Report shall be submitted at the latest on **30<sup>th</sup> January 2012**.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

8. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online on <http://www.undp.tj> by **30<sup>th</sup> October 2011, 12:00 CET**

**The application should contain** current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

Shortlisted candidates will be invited to present a price offer indicating the total cost in USD of the assignment (including the daily fee, per diem and travel costs) preferably according the template attached in [Annex 6](#))

*UNDP applies fair and transparent selection process that would take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals.*

*Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*UNDP is a non-smoking work environment.*

*Due to large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform the unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.*

.