



Tajikistan

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	2
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	4
4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION	6
5. EVALUATION APPROACH	7
6. DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM	8
7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS	9
8. APPLICATION PROCESS	10
Annex 1. Revised Logical Framework and Project Performance Indicators	12
Annex 2a. Evaluation Report: Sample Outline	16
Annex 2b. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations	18
Annex 3. Co-financing Table	21
Annex 4. Rate tables	22
Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluation Team	24
Annex 6. Cost breakdown template	25

Project Title:	Environmental Learning and Stakeholder Involvement as Tools for Global Environmental Benefits and Poverty Reduction, PIMS 3514
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 scorecard¹;
- 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.

¹ 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.

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.

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

Activity	Timing	Estimated duration
Briefings for Evaluation Team by UNDP CO and UNDP EEP	Till 30 th November 2011	1 day
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings, presentation of main findings	Between December 1 st and 30 th	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 th January 2012	2 days
Finalization of the terminal evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	Till 30 th 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 **30th 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 **30th 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.

Annex 1. Revised Logical Framework and Project Performance Indicators

Project Strategy		Revised Indicators			
	Indicator	Baseline	Target at E. of Project	Sources of verification	Risks
Goal	To expand Tajikistan's capacity to generate global environmental benefits through educating and involving diverse national and local stakeholders in addressing Rio Convention themes.				
Objective: To strengthen capacity to use environmental learning and stakeholder involvement as tools to address natural resource management issues as part of poverty reduction.	1. Use of EE, EL and SI to address NRM and poverty issues by the State Committee on Environmental Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These models & techniques in EE, EL and SI are rarely used for NRM in Tajikistan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diverse and high quality EE/EL and SI programmes and activities planned or underway to address NRM and poverty issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports / PIRs Programmes integrating these models and techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to election, political changes or other events, changes in governmental priorities might happen and the GOT might not remain committed to environmental education, environmental learning, stakeholder involvement and access to environmental information (<i>political</i>) The objective of the project might be too ambitious and the support from the project resources and the government resources may not be adequate to initiate the changes required by the project strategy (<i>strategic</i>) Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines (<i>operational</i>)
	2. Citizens involvement in decision-making to address NRM and poverty issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few opportunities for stakeholder involvement in NRM decisions at national or community levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders involved in implementing NRM programmes and projects Decision-making processes revised to encourage stakeholder involvement and institutionalized within the NRM framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants in decision-making processes for NRM Documentation of consultation process 	
	3. Public access to environmental information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited public access to environmental information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 brochures and 1 web site on environmental information available to the public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web sites Content of Relevant reports Surveys 	
	4. Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement: 1 of 9 Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 3 of 12 Policy and legislation development: 1 of 9 Management and implementation: 1 of 6 	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement: 6 of 9 Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 9 of 12 Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9 Management and implementation: 4 of 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mid-term and final evaluation reports Annual PIRs Capacity assessment reports 	

Project Strategy	Revised Indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target at E. of Project	Sources of verification	Risks
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (total score: 11/42) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and evaluate: 6 of 6 (total targeted score: 30/42) 		
Outcome 1: Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education/learning and stakeholder involvement as natural resource management tools.	5. A revised State Programme for EE and EL integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions' obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current programme is poorly known, weakly implemented and does not include conventions' obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A revised State programme addressing Rio and Aarhus Conventions' obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised State Programme Evaluation and monitoring reports of State Programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The government does not fulfil its international obligations; including those from the Aarhus and the 3 Rio Conventions related to EL, EE and SI (<i>political</i>)
	6. Adequate legislation for EE, EL, SI and AEI in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few opportunities for SI in NRM decisions at national and community levels within current legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making processes revised, including SI and AEI and introduced in legislation related to NRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laws adopted by the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New legislation proposed by the project is not adopted by the Government and/or the Parliament (<i>political</i>)
	7. Adequate institutional set-up with clear mandate to carry out EE, EL, SI and provide AEI.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak institutional mandates and no clear responsibilities for EE, EL, SI and AEI in NRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions with clear mandates and assigned responsibilities to implement the State Programme on EE and EL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions mandated by the government Job descriptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The government is not committed to revise the State Programme on environmental education (<i>strategic</i>) The government is not committed to implement institutional changes proposed during the implementation of the project (<i>political</i>)
Outcome 2: Improved capacity of government and civil society to integrate environmental learning and stakeholder involvement into programmes and projects.	8. Number of systematically implemented EL activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 EL activities occurring, mostly ad hoc and with uncertain effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 EL programmes being systematically implemented by government institutions and civil society organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government annual reporting on environment and NRM programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak capacity of the Committee for Environment Protection and its constantly changing status. This may affect the project implementation and cause delays since it is the implementing partner of the project (<i>operational</i>) The training centres for public servants and teachers might not be interested in integrating into their training
	9. Quantity and quality of EE, EL and SI materials and delivery mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are few EE, EL and SI materials customized to the Tajik context Absence of formal training delivery mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 materials adapted to the Tajik context Training Centre established Some specific training modules established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants' reports Produced Materials 	

Project Strategy	Revised Indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target at E. of Project	Sources of verification	Risks
	10. Number of participants trained in EE, EL and SI using the module developed by the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very limited training currently offered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 500 people trained (civil servants, teachers, NGO staff, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports / PIRs Training evaluation forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project (<i>operational</i>) Key agencies and managers in ministries give a high priority to EE/EL programmes (<i>operational</i>)
Outcome 3: Enhanced capacity of local government and community organisations to use community environmental learning and involvement as tools for natural resource management and poverty reduction.	11. Increased use of community EL techniques by local governments in programmes and projects to address NRM and poverty reduction at the local level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments use very little EL techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments in the four selected Jamoats are using EL as a tool to involve communities to address NRM issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of local government meetings Field visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The decentralization of NRM responsibilities at the district level does not occur (<i>political</i>) Local governments do not have the mandate to involve stakeholders in decision-making for NRM and poverty reduction activities (<i>political</i>) The community EL kit is not adopted by local governments (<i>strategic</i>) JRCs are not sustained in Tajikistan (<i>strategic</i>)
	12. A community EL Kit adopted and disseminated in Tajikistan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community EL resources available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EL kit finalized and disseminated in Tajikistan at the district level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EL Kit Field visits 	
	13. Community EL incorporated into JRCs' terms of references, strategies and programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JRCs focus more on social and livelihood issues and EL is not used systematically to address local NRM issues; including conventions related issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JRCs in pilot districts (4) have integrated community EL into their programming and activities; including the Revolving Funds Other JRCs in Tajikistan have adopted the same approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field visits Pilot project reports Progress reports / PIRs Minutes of JRCs meetings 	
Outcome 4: Effective, efficient, and adaptive project management, monitoring and	14. Project management consistent with UNDP and GEF standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management procedures not in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP and GEF standards used consistently by the project management team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project progress reports & PIRs Evaluation reports Contracts, RFPs, Purchase Orders, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project management team does not apply proper UNDP/GEF management and administration procedures (<i>operational</i>)

Project Strategy	Revised Indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target at E. of Project	Sources of verification	Risks
evaluation.	15. Good practices and lessons learned packaged as knowledge products and disseminated through national and international networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No knowledge products are available to the relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project web site Stakeholders web sites Publications, brochures References to this products and reports, and seminars 	

Annex 2a. Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

Minimum GEF requirements¹

Executive summary

- ♣ 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 rated²)*

0 Project formulation

- ♣ Implementation approach (*) (i)
- ♣ Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- ♣ Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- ♣ Country ownership/Driveness
- ♣ Stakeholder participation (*)
- ♣ Replication approach
- ♣ Cost-effectiveness
- ♣ UNDP comparative advantage
- ♣ Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- ♣ Management arrangements

0 Implementation

- ♣ Implementation approach (*) (ii)
- ♣ The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- ♣ Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- ♣ Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- ♣ Financial Planning
- ♣ Monitoring and evaluation (*)

¹ Please refer to GEF guidelines for explanation of Terminology

² The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

- ♣ Execution and implementation modalities
- ♣ Management by the UNDP country office
- ♣ Coordination and operational issues

0 Results

- ♣ Attainment of objectives (*)
- ♣ Sustainability (*)
- ♣ Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

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

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
- ♣ Final Completed GEF Capacity Development Scorecard

Annex 2b. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- ♣ The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- ♣ Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- ♣ Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- ♣ Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- ♣ Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- ♣ Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- ♣ Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- ♣ The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- ♣ The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives
- ♣ Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- ♣ Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- ♣ Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- ♣ Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- ♣ Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- ♣ Fulfilment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- ♣ Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.

- ♣ Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- ♣ Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- ♣ Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- ♣ Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- ♣ Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- ♣ Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- ♣ Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- ♣ Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- ♣ Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- ♣ Expansion of demonstration projects.
- ♣ Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- ♣ Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- ♣ Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing³.
- ♣ Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- ♣ Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- ♣ Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- ♣ The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.

³ Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

- ♣ The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

Annex 3. Co-financing Table

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Loans										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments *										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

- Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.
- "Proposed" co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Describe "Non-grant Instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):
 - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash/purpose.*
- Explain "Other Sources of Co-financing":
 - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash*
 - ...
 - ...

Annex 4. Rate tables

Table 1: Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY*	RATING**
Objective :				
OUTCOMES		END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
Outcome 1:				
Outcome 2:				
Outcome 3:				
Outcome 4:				
Outcome 5:				

* *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

Table 2: Project ratings

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE						RATING
	HU	U	MU	MS	S	HS	
PROJECT FORMULATION							
Conceptualization/Design							
Stakeholder participation							
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION							
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							
PROJECT RESULTS							
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives							
Achievement of objective							
Outcome 1							
Outcome 2							
Outcome 3							
Outcome 4							
Outcome 5							
Outcome 6							
Outcome 7							
OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT							

Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluation Team

The following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

Document	Description
Project document	Project Document
Project reports	Inception Report Quarterly Progress Reports AWP's SC meeting minutes CTA Mission reports
Annual Project Reports to GEF	PIR 2009 PIR 2010, PIR 2011
Other relevant materials:	Project key document outputs GEF Capacity Development Scorecard

Annex 6. Cost breakdown template

	Units*	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office			
Desk review			
Briefings by UNDP and PM			
Drafting of the evaluation report			
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms			
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)			
Work on mission			
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings			
Sub-total fee			
Travel costs			
International travel to and from Tajikistan			
Local travel (to be arranged and covered by the project)	n/a	n/a	n/a
DSA (overnights)			
Sub-total travel costs			
TOTAL			

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