



TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GEF Project:

PIMS 1786 - “Demonstrating new approaches to Protected Areas and Biodiversity Management in the Gissar Mountains as a model for strengthening the national Tajikistan Protected Areas System”

Contents

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.....	15
Annex 2b. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations.....	17
Annex 3. Co-financing Table.....	20
Annex 4. Rate tables	21
Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators	23
Annex 6. Cost breakdown template	24

Project Title:	Demonstrating new approaches to Protected Areas and Biodiversity Management in the Gissar Mountains as a model for strengthening the national Tajikistan Protected Areas System, PIMS 1786
Functional Titles:	International Expert / Team Leader National Expert
Duration:	estimated 20 working days over the period of: August - October 2011.
Terms of Payment:	Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the 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 project aimed to substantively improve management effectiveness and capacities in three selected protected areas in Tajikistan with the total area of 32,839 ha. The project will attempted to strengthen the overall enabling environment for PA management in Tajikistan and disseminate lessons and best practices systematically to the rest of the National System of Protected Areas – as such, the project should indirectly benefit an additional 2,548,232 ha of protected areas.

Background: Tajikistan's current PA system is a legacy from the Former Soviet Union (FSU). While many good things can be said of this system, it is now outdated and in many respects irrelevant to the new

social and economic realities of Tajikistan emerging from years of conflict and in transition to a market economy. In Tajikistan most PAs often exist only on paper, and all suffer severe barriers to effective conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity, including: fragmented institutional and management responsibilities, reduction of capacity due to qualified staff losses, severe cuts in funding, policy and legal inconsistencies and weaknesses, inadequate information and monitoring, and an absence of mechanisms for participation, benefit sharing and conflict resolution with local communities.

Amidst these problems and barriers, however, lies a strategic opportunity to influence the emergence of a new national PA System in Tajikistan, as the country is currently engaged in the process of creating the legal and institutional ground work for a democratic political system and a market based economy and has recently completed its Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP).

Goal: Thus, the goal of this project was to help catalyze the emergence of a sustainable national PA system in Tajikistan. The project has focused on demonstrating improved, holistic management in three target PAs, and the productive areas in their periphery, that represent a cross section of the PA categories of Tajikistan. These demonstration areas, and the experience gained there, form the basis for applying new approaches to the PA system as a whole.

The project attempted to: introduce new systematic and participatory management practices; strengthen capacity in terms of ecological, technical, socio-economic, and financial planning; reach out to, and involve, "non-traditional" PA stakeholders; include a focus on the wider landscape context of the reserves and not just the reserves themselves; clarify and rationalize policies affecting PA management; and demonstrate viable approaches to resolving key resource-use issues that negatively affect PA management and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

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

- Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan (CEP), specifically State Forestry Agency and State Directorate for Protected Areas
- Parliament of Tajikistan
- District and Sub-District Authorities in project demonstration area (Gissar)
- The Protected Areas of Shirkent Peoples Park, Almosi Nature Reserve, and Romit Strict Nature Reserve
- 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 Final Evaluation Report to be prepared under this Terms of Reference will be submitted.

The Project Document was signed between the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, CARE International and UNDP Country Office on 3 January 2006. Initially the project was implemented by CARE International (NGO Execution modality) but following the Mid Term Evaluation and CARE's closure of their activities in Tajikistan, the project was directly implemented by UNDP. The Project was originally planned for five years (January 2005 to December 2010) but a "no-cost" extension of 1 year was approved based on the recommendation of the mid-term evaluation.

Three project outcomes are defined in the Project Document:

1.	Strengthened environmental governance provides a more sustainable land-use context for the PA system
2.	New management practices are introduced and capacity built in target PAs; overall management effectiveness and sustainability of the PA system substantively improved
3.	Practical examples for stakeholders of how to achieve environmentally sustainable livelihoods around target Pas

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 2011 Annual Project Implementation Review (to be available for 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 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 also assess how recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation have been implemented.

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 international NGO initially implementing the project and subsequently 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 the results with reference to the 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 sustained conservation and use of biodiversity, impact on capacity of Protected Areas agency field and HQ staff, impact on capacity to effectively manage PA's, impact on involvement of "non-typical" partners in PA management planning, level of sensitization and awareness within project target area about relevant environmental and biodiversity issues, impact on commitment of local authorities and communities to sustainable land use and conservation, impact on land use practices, awareness of communities about relevant energy efficiency technologies);
 - e) *Global environmental benefits* – conservation of globally important biodiversity.
 - 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;
 - 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 biodiversity / forestry management and use
- Has there been any change in the perception and understanding of CEP staff (forestry and PA), and parliamentarians on mechanisms and approaches for managing and sustainably using forestry and biodiversity resources.
- Have there been changes in the understanding and knowledge of Protected Areas HQ and field staff regarding the purpose of the Protected areas system in the context of Tajikistan's national development, and the management of Protected areas.
- Has the project provided a sustainable mechanism for applying more effective management planning to national PA system. 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 value of the PA's and the importance of sustainably using natural resources.
- Have there been changes in local stakeholder behaviour (i.e. threats, land use management practices...) that have contributed to improved conservation? If not, why not?
- Has the project established a management basis for long term sustainability and development of project outcomes?
- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results, especially the multiple changes of government counterpart institutions and personnel, and the wider economic and political development context of Tajikistan. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's strategies managing these factors.

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 stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to 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, project reports – incl. Annual Reports, project budget revision, progress reports, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, CTA mission reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, final GEF Tracking tool (METT), and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. Final GEF Tracking tool (METT) should be commented by evaluation team and finalized after incorporating of 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;
- ♣ 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 Consultant

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 and interviews (2 days);
- 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 Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics or other related areas;
- 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the biodiversity conservation and protected areas projects;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating protected areas and/or biodiversity conservation projects 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 management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation;
- Familiarity with protected area 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.

National Consultant will assist International Expert 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 management/biodiversity conservation;
- 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 **August – October 2011**.

The activity and tentative timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Timing	Estimated duration
Desk review	August 2011	2 days
Briefings for evaluators by UNDP CO and UNDP EEP	Till 30 August 2011	1 day
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings, presentation of main findings	Between September 1 st and 30th	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 October 2011	2 days
Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	Till 30 th October 2011	2 days
		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 Evaluation Report shall be submitted latest on **30th October 2011**.

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://jobs.undp.org> by **1st July 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

Overall Objective/Project Objective	Performance Indicators for measurement	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions/Risks
Development Objective/Goal:					
Project Goal: To catalyze the improved conservation of globally significant biodiversity in Tajikistan through the demonstration of new mechanisms and approaches for effective management of protected areas and natural resources adjacent to them.					
Project Objective:					
Project Objective: To strengthen the management effectiveness and sustainability of the three selected protected areas of different types on the southern slopes of the Gissar Mountains, and thereby to provide models and best practices replicable throughout the national PA system.	Improved Management effectiveness of protected areas in Tajikistan	METT scores Current average METT score – 22 for the PA system	METT scores improved by 100% from the baseline average within 10 years post project.	METT scores	Tajikistan continues to experience political stability allowing PA system to function and develop
	No further reduction in the total land under conservation management compared with the baseline.	25,100 ha (under PA) 105,500 ha – surrounding landscape 3,100,000 ha under system level	25,100 ha (under PA) 105,500 ha – surrounding landscape 3,100,000 ha under system level (the whole PA system in Tajikistan)	METT scores Official registration documents Official statistics	Government of Tajikistan maintains interest towards PAs and conservation of critical ecosystems
Outcome 1: Strengthened environmental governance provides a more sustainable land-use context for the PA system	Local policies on sustainable land-use designed and supported by the selected local governments	Policies on sustainable land-use at local level do not exist	Policies on sustainable land-use at local level designed and supported by the selected local governments	Document review, observations, key informant interviews	Continued government support for PAs and sustainable land use
	Sustainable land use practices adopted by selected communities and community members Amendments to the existing or new versions of the: Protected Areas Law and the	No widely accepted sustainable land-use practices exist New draft of the Protected Areas Law exists but required a thorough	Sustainable land-use practices implemented by selected communities and community members New draft prepared, consultations held by mid 2007	Baseline surveys, APRs, mid-term evaluation, official government reports and interviews with project partners, minutes of major stakeholder meetings Document review, observations, key informant interviews	Local and national authorities actively support and participate in project activities

Overall Objective/Project Objective	Performance Indicators for measurement	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions/Risks
	Forest Code prepared and submitted to the Parliament	revision Current Forest Code of 1993 is considered outdated and needs to be revised	The draft law submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007 New draft or amendments prepared and consultations held by mid 2007 New draft or amendments submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	Document review, observations, key informant interviews	That Government of Tajikistan will support legal revisions necessary to improve environmental governance and land-use practices in and around PAs
Outcome 2: New management practices are introduced and capacity built in target PAs; overall management effectiveness and sustainability of the PA system substantively improved	METT Scores increased in all 3 PA's by the end of yr4 of the project Shirkent NP Romit Zapovednik Almosi	Romit Zapovednik -23 Almosi Zakaznik- 30 Nature Historical Park Shirkent –15	Romit Zapovednik -50 Almosi Zakaznik- 50 Nature Historical Park Shirkent – 50	METT Report sheets at the end of the project	Government of Tajikistan will undertake required system wide institutional/ legal revisions necessary to improve PA management structure
	Financing from state budget for three PAs increased.	3 PAs do not receive full amounts of committed/requested funds. Romit Zapovednik - 3,641USD (official) actual amount is usually half of the official Almosi Zakaznik - 555 USD (actual) Nature Historical park Shirkent – 4,000 USD (official) actual amount is 926USD	Increased financing for 3 PAs by the end of the project at least by 50% of the baseline actual amounts	Financial documents; management plan review documents, interviews.	Government of Tajikistan remains supportive of the PA system development and commits necessary funds for its successful development

Overall Objective/Project Objective	Performance Indicators for measurement	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions/Risks
	Number of households involved and benefiting from alternative livelihoods (for example, forestry management, pastures management, family-based nature tourism, beekeeping, medicinal plant production)	Few / none	At least 20	Field visits & interviews. APRs	Local authorities remain supportive of project activities
Outcome 3: Practical examples for stakeholders of how to achieve environmentally sustainable livelihoods around target PAs	Number of households with improved energy efficiency (stoves, weatherization)	Little or none	At least 10 households	Field visits & interviews. APRs	Local population accepts ideas of energy efficiency and advanced but low-cost technologies
	Number of projects on use of alternative energy resources	Little or none	At least 4	Field visits & interviews APRs	

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 rated¹)*

θ **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

θ **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

¹ The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

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

θ **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 GEF Tracking tool (METT)

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 financing².
- ♣ 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

² 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.

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.
- ♣ 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 OBJECTIVE	COMPONENT	OR	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 Evaluators

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 Mid-term Evaluation Report CTA Mission reports
Annual Project Report to GEF	PIR 2006 PIR 2007 PIR 2008 PIR 2009, PIR 2010
Other relevant materials:	Maps Project key document outputs (PA System Concept, Management Plan Instructions and format, target PA management plans) GEF Tracking Tool (METT)

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.