



**Evaluation**

**Output 2**

**Rural Growth Programme**

**UNDP**

**Republic of Tajikistan**

**Evaluation Report**

**Kris B. Prasada Rao**  
**Alisher Khaydarov**

**Aug 2013**

## List of acronyms, terminology and currency exchange rates

### Acronyms

AFT	Aid for Trade
AKF	Aga Khan Foundation
AO	Area Office
BEE	Business Enabling Environment
CDP	Community Development Plan
CO	Country Office
CP	Communities Programme
DCC	Tajikistan Development Coordination Council
DDP	District Development Plan
DFID	Department for International Development
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DP	Development Plan
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GREAT	Growth in the Rural Economy and Agriculture of Tajikistan
HDI	Human Development Index
ICST	Institute for Civil Servants Training
IFC	International Finance Corporation, the World Bank
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
JDP	Jamoat Development Plan
LED	Local Economic Development
LEPI	Local Economic Performance Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEDT	Ministry of Economic Development and Trade
MC	Mahalla Committee
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSDSP	Mountain Societies Development Support Programme
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise
NDS	National Development Strategy
NIM	National Implementation Modality
O2	Output 2, RGP
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
ODP	Oblast Development Plan: Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Co-operation Directorate
PEI	UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative
PPD	Public-Private Dialogue
Prodoc	Programme Document
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
RGP	Rural Growth Programme
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
TAPRI	Tajikistan Afghanistan Poverty Reduction Initiative
TajWSS	Tajikistan Water Supply and Sanitation project
TF	Trust Fund

TSJ	Tajik Somoni
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USD	US Dollar
VDF	Village Development Fund (mahalla level)
VDP	Village Development Plan (mahalla level)
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation
WG	Working Group (especially for development planning)
ZVI	Zerafshan Valley Initiative

### **Tajik terminology**

Dehkan	Farmer
Hashar	Community labour provided in kind
Hukumat	Government
Jamoat	Sub-district
Kishlak	Village
Mahalla	Community
Oblast	Region
Rayon	District

### **Exchange rate**

1 US Dollar (USD) = 4.7674 Tajik Somoni (TJS)

## Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Context and purpose of the evaluation .....	5
1.2	Brief description of programme.....	5
1.3	Analytical/conclusion summary .....	6
1.4	Main recommendations and lessons learned.....	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	Purpose of the evaluation .....	13
2.2	Approach and methodology.....	13
2.3	Key questions, scope and limitations of the evaluation.....	13
<b>3</b>	<b>Description of RGP O2 .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1	Background and context.....	15
3.2	The Rural Growth Programme (RGP).....	16
3.3	Output 2 (O2) rationale and intervention logic.....	16
3.4	RGP O2 management and implementation arrangements.....	17
3.5	Main stakeholders .....	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Findings .....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1	Programme coordination, administration, and implementation .....	21
4.1.1	<i>Partnerships and linkages</i> .....	21
4.1.2	<i>Monitoring</i> .....	24
4.1.3	<i>Budget and spending</i> .....	27
4.2	Progress and results.....	29
4.2.1	<i>Support to development planning</i> .....	29
4.2.2	<i>Trust fund</i> .....	36
4.2.3	<i>Support to institutional capacity to create a business enabling environment</i> ....	44
4.2.4	<i>Crosscutting issues</i> .....	46
4.3	External factors – risks and assumptions .....	49
4.4	Relevance .....	51
4.5	Efficiency.....	53
4.6	Effectiveness.....	54
4.7	Impact.....	57
4.8	Sustainability.....	58
4.9	Potential for upscaling/replication .....	61
<b>5</b>	<b>Overview of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned .....</b>	<b>63</b>
5.1	Conclusions .....	63
5.2	Recommendations .....	71
5.3	Lessons learned.....	73
	<b>Annexes: .....</b>	<b>77</b>
	Annex 1: Terms of Reference .....	78
	Annex 2: Evaluation programme.....	86
	Annex 3: Persons interviewed.....	88
	Annex 4: Documents reviewed.....	90
	Annex 5: Outline of the main activity results by June 2013.....	96
	Annex 6: Relevant policies, laws and regulations .....	99
	Annex 7: Responses to evaluation questions .....	102
	Annex 8: Assessment of status of risks from Prodoc.....	109
	Annex 9: Assessment of status of assumptions from Prodoc.....	110
	Annex 10: OECD/DAC and UNDP definitions of evaluation criteria .....	111
	Annex 11: Output 2 logframe (May 2012 revision) .....	113
	Annex 12: Financial report on O2 expenditures (January 2010 – March 2013) .....	115

Annex 13: Overview of Trust Fund contributions .....	118
Annex 14: DDP implementation status per 1 April 2013 .....	122
Annex 15: District economic indicators 2010-2012 .....	124

## 1 Executive Summary

### 1.1 Context and purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation of Output 2 (O2) of the Rural Growth Programme (RGP) is to: a) provide an independent analysis of the relevance, implementation efficiency, impact, and sustainability of RGP O2; and b) capture lessons learned to inform future programme design and implementation in Tajikistan.

The objective of the evaluation is to assess implementation progress and achievements against the targets set for O2, with special emphasis on: a) evaluating the relevance, sustainability and impact of new approaches piloted and their contribution to achieving the overall RGP objective; and b) evaluating the extent to which links with national development strategies and priorities, and synergies with the development priorities pursued by the Tajikistan Development Coordination Council (DCC), were achieved.

The evaluation was carried out as a final/post-implementation evaluation; comprising a document review, interviews with stakeholders, and visits to TF sub-project sites. The standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria used by UNDP were applied: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact. The evaluation also assessed the extent to which the implementation of O2 addressed the crosscutting issues of environmental sustainability, gender equity, and migration.

### 1.2 Brief description of programme

#### **RGP Output 2**

The Rural Growth Programme (RGP) in Sughd Oblast was a DFID, UNDP and GIZ funded three-year initiative. It was implemented in 2010-2012 (except O2, which was given an extension till 30 June 2013) in 14 rural districts and 65 jamoats of Sughd Oblast by UNDP and GIZ with the involvement of other partners and sub-contractors. The purpose (expected outcome) of RGP was: *“Local environment for income generation and employment creation in Sughd Oblast, including for women and poor enhanced”*. UNDP lead the implementation of Output 2 (O2): ***“Improving capacities of local governance actors (particularly at rayon and jamoat levels) for local development planning with an emphasis on rural economic growth, including the implementation and monitoring of local development plans in line with NDS and PRS.”*** O2 was the only output, which focused on building local government capacity (the four GIZ led Outputs focus on facilitating access for producers to extension services and credit, strengthening vocational training, and strengthening business associations).

The rationale behind O2 vis-à-vis the goal and purpose of RGP was that local governments play an important role in creating a conducive/enabling environment for private sector investments and activities, income generation and job creation, and overall economic development. While the output had a focus on economic activities, it also worked at enabling local governments to develop comprehensive and holistic development plans (DPs). O2 comprised three sub-components/legs:

1. Support to participatory planning at the oblast (regional), district, jamoat (sub-district) and mahalla (community) levels and formulation of development plans (DPs).
2. A Trust Fund providing support to implementing selected priorities outlined in the district and jamoat development plans (DDPs and JDPs).
3. Support to enhancing local institutional capacity for creation of a more favourable business-enabling environment (BEE), through piloting and introduction of e-governance elements, introducing and promoting district platforms for public-private dialogue (PPD).

A Programme Steering Committee comprising representatives of Sughd Oblast authorities, MEDT, the Ministry of Agriculture, the State Committee for Investments and State Property Management, DFID, UNDP, and GIZ provided strategic overall oversight and guidance to RGP. The UNDP Communities Programme Team in Dushanbe and UNDP Communities Programme area offices (AOs) in Khujand AO and Ayni were responsible for programme coordination and implementation. Sughd Oblast and each district had a Working Group (WG) for DP development; these WGs comprised members from government, private sector and civil society. The oblast and districts authorities led the implementation of their respective DPs.

The Trust Fund (TF) was led by an oblast level Evaluation Committee comprising two representatives from the oblast authorities, one private sector representative, one civil society representative, and one donor representative; this group select sub-project proposals for TF funding. District governments were responsible for the implementation of the funded sub-projects. TF funds are managed by the oblast government.

The Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT) developed and refined with support from UNDP the development planning methodology. MEDT houses a consultant team, which provided ToT (training of trainers) on oblast, districts and jamoats on development planning, M&E, budgeting, and other topics. Some of the consultants on the team are recruited by UNDP, others by MEDT. The trainers trained came from private sector and NGOs, and provided direct training for district and jamoat authority staff.

IOM implemented activities related to migration, and the Mountain Societies Development Support Programme MSDSP of the Aga Khan Foundation implemented the community level activities.

### **1.3 Analytical/conclusion summary**

The targets for Output 2 (O2) in the revised logframe were achieved:

- 14 districts development plans (DDPs) and 65 jamoat development plans (JDPs) were developed and the Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan for 2012-2015 was updated.
- The target of 21 Trust Funds sub-project implemented for the Trust Fund (TF) was significantly surpassed; 131 sub-projects were implemented.

- The target associated with the BEE component of implementing four initiatives at the local level to enhance business environment was met: district websites with e-governance elements, district public-private dialogue (PPD) forums, local economic performance indicator (LEPI) piloting, local economic development (LED) training, business perception surveys, and an investment profile published for Sughd.

### **Development planning:**

O2 worked on development planning at multiple levels (central, oblast, district, jamoat, and mahalla). MEDT's DP methodology was revised to be more decentralised, localised, participatory and bottom-up; and incorporating cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, migration, conflict prevention, and disaster risks reduction). The new approach rolled out focused on enhancing transparency, accountability and inclusiveness, by a) establishing working groups (WGs) for development planning which included government, private sector and community representatives, b) conducting consultations and public hearings, and c) supporting selected jamoats and mahalla committees in preparing their own development plans, from which some priorities were lifted into the DDPs. In the case of mahalla committees (MCs), the Aga Kahn Foundation has under O2 facilitated the registration of 226 MCs as formal entities, the establishment of village development funds.

The DDPs has enhanced the ability of the districts to mobilise funding for to investments in development from multiple sources (public, private, community, foreign investors, and donors). 47% the DDP have on average been implemented, although there is significant variation due to differences in capacities and potential to attract funding. The extent to which JDPs have been implemented is not clear to the evaluation team. At the community level, the supported MCs were able to raise modest funds from their members to implement priorities from their plans. Economic training and legal counselling was provided for migrants by IOM and its partners, one result has been that a significant proportion of funding provided to village development funds were derived from remittances.

Remaining challenges: While the private sector has participated in WGs and contributed to DDPs implementation, there is still scope for further private sector involvement. Furthermore, while the DDPs are quite comprehensive in their thematic coverage, some issues remain, including a tendency to focus on "hard" infrastructure over "soft" management and capacity related aspects. Furthermore, while environment, gender, migration, and disaster risk reduction issues are reflected in all DDPs, the extent to which they are addressed, but the extent to which a good analysis is done and priority projects that address the keys issues have been identified varies significantly among DDPs.

### **Trust Fund:**

The TF was an incentive mechanism to demonstrate the value of development planning, and the principal O2 mechanism for supporting the implementation of DPs. The TF was administered by Sughd oblast government in accordance with government financial management and



procurement procedures. Difficulties in setting up the TF while ensuring both government and UNDP regulations were adhered to caused significant delays and the funding was available for sub-projects from March 2012. After this significant delay, TF implementation took off, and two rounds of sub-projects were implemented in late 2011-mid 2013, with allocations for districts in the second round based on their performance in the first round of sub-project implementation.

The TF provided USD 2,100,000 for development plan (DP) implementation, with an additional USD 50,000 from UNDP-UNEP's Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI). The stakeholder contribution (especially from communities and in some cases private sector, in cash and in kind) for TF sub-projects was high, albeit with significant variations at the district level. The total contribution from government (central, oblast and district) was 9%, the community and private sector contribution was 36%, and the remaining 55% came from the TF. Government ownership of the TF is very high; there is a strong wish to continue the TF and willingness to gradually increase oblast and district contributions.

The first round of TF sub-projects covered 21,334 households, corresponding to 128,039 people, including 59,014 women (46%). An estimated 6,646 jobs were created, including 4,492 jobs for women (67.5%).

Important benefits of the TF model included: a) the TF demonstrated the ability of oblast and district government to handle donor fund; and b) it helped building local government capacity to prepare proposals and implement sub-projects.

Remaining challenges: Most TF sub-projects were infrastructure sub-projects; this has been an issue of debate vis-à-vis the intention of RGP to support private sector and improving the business enabling environment (BEE): on one hand, it is argued that infrastructure is a prerequisite for private sector development and the infrastructure was of an economic nature; on the other hand, it is argued that infrastructure is expensive and other and larger funding sources are available for this, and the sub-projects did not focus on overall BEE improvements. It should in this regard be considered that the TF actually provided less than 0.6% of the total funding mobilised for DDP implementation. Sub-projects were selected according to scores obtained against specific economic, social, financial and environmental criteria – but with a higher weight given to the economic criteria; and the TF guidelines did not include a formal demand environmental impact assessments or mitigation plans. Due to the delays with setting up the TF, the timeframe for sub-project implementation was limited, which in some cases affected sub-project quality.

#### **BEE:**

The main activities of this sub-component were: the provision of websites with e-governance elements for 14 districts, public-private dialogue (PPD) forums established in three districts, piloting the local economic performance indicator (LEPI) in one district, local economic development (LED) training, and business perception surveys. LED was integrated in the training package for

development planning. The other activities were implemented toward the end of O2, and in the case of PPD and LEPI on a pilot scale, and it is too early to assess their results. However, the PPDs could potentially become a tool to enhance private sector involvement in DDP planning, and LEPI could prove a useful tool in monitoring changes in the BEE.

**Programme management and coordination:**

UNDP has been very successful in creating synergies between RGP O2 other UNDP programmes in terms of: building on experiences, refining methodologies, addressing cross-cutting issues, and utilising existing structures. However, due to government capacity constraints and the limited time available, UNDP was very, and probably overly, hands-on in supporting TF sub-project planning and implementation.

The design logic of RGP was not sufficiently strong in practical terms to justify having O2 and Output 3-6 in the same programme. UNDP and GIZ coordinated efforts, but the actual scope for this was somewhat limited due to having different implementing partners. The insufficient logical connection between the outputs has created some misunderstandings, tensions and frustrations, e.g. in relation to the role of GREAT and the future of O2. The RGP logframe did not provide sufficient detail to serve as a management tool guiding the implementation of O2.

**Performance against evaluation criteria:**

Relevance: The focus and approach of O2 was very relevant in relation to the roll-out of new policies and MEDT's methodology on decentralisation and more inclusive and transparent development planning based on local priorities. O2 supported the implementation at the local level of NDS and PRS. The relevance is evidenced by the strong government and beneficiary ownership, although private sector ownership appears somewhat mixed. That districts could access TF funds to implement sub-project of their own priority was instrumental for the creation of ownership; but it also meant that TH sub-projects tended to focus on fairly traditional infrastructure projects rather than strategically enabling districts to implement sub-projects addressing "soft" priorities, e.g. on BEE and crosscutting issues.

Efficiency: Overall, the use of resources (human and financial) of O2 appears quite good. The use of CP as a mechanism enabled the programme to benefit from already established structures and methodologies. The implementation of O2 was mostly as being timely and without significant delays other than the delays with setting up the TF. Once the TF was operational, the use of Government's procedures for the TF has not caused significant delays. However, earlier initiation of district PPDs could have enabled them to be upscaled and contribute to the DDPs formulation process (it should be noted that PPDs were not part of the original O2 design). While UNDP support was generally appropriate, UNDP was been quite hands-on and allocated significant staff-time resources. The allocated budget for O2 has generally been spent in accordance with the provisions in the budget of the Prodoc. The cost-effectiveness generally appears good. The average costs for capacity building, development plan preparation (DDPs, JDPs, and VDPs), etc. was

below USD 175,000 per district, and UNDP has estimated the economic return at USD 99 per USD invested. For the first round of TF sub-projects, UNDP has calculated the rate of return on the sub-project investments at 11.1 USD per USD invested.

Effectiveness: O2 met, or exceeded, the intended targets. The development planning approach of O2 has enhanced transparency and inclusion of local stakeholders from the mahalla to the oblast level. The DDPs have also proven a useful tool for mobilising both local and external resources for the implementation of development priorities, and many DDPs display a good degree of implementation. The TF appears to have been an effective mechanism for building the capacity of district governments to implement their DDPs. However, there are still shortcomings in the conceptual understanding of “soft “ issues, as well as BEE and crosscutting issues, and the ability to address these strategically and coherently remains limited. O2 was fairly effective *in promoting a more fertile relationship between public and private sectors and to contributing to local development*, although private sector mobilisation was generally not quite as strong as community mobilisation.

Impact: The extent to which the DDPs have contributed to changes in terms of jobs created and enhanced production is not possible to assess, and the possible impacts of the new DP process are unlikely to fully materialise in the short term. TF funded sub-projects led to tangible changes for direct beneficiaries in terms of increased incomes and access to jobs, and thereby contributed to an improved BEE for the agricultural sector. It is not possible to measure the contribution of O2 to achieving the Goal and Purpose for RGP, but the evaluation team believes O2 as begun to contribute to this.

Sustainability: The strong commitment to and ownership of, the planning process by both local and central government significantly enhances the likeliness of sustainability. A number of districts, but probably not all, now seem to have the capacity to plan and implement DDPs using the RGP supported MEDT methodology. The capacity is much lower at jamoat than district level, and further support would be needed to ensure that JDPs of a good quality will feed into future DDPs. O2 included the MEDT planning methodology in the ICST curriculum to ensure that government staff in the future is trained in the DP process, but it is highly unlikely that ICST and MEDT will be able to provide the same level of support as UNDP. Considering the strong local ownership of the TF, there is potential for it to become a valuable medium term mechanism. However, the de-facto procedure of centralised establishment of tariffs (e.g. on irrigation water) poses a challenge for the ensuring full O&M cost recovery, and can potentially threaten the sustainability of infrastructure investments – O2 sought to address this by committing beneficiaries to provide in-cash contributions for maintenance.

**Potential for upscaling/replication:**

The development planning process can, and will in the coming years, be upscaled to national coverage. The MEDT planning methodology as been updated with approaches from O2, and is now moving towards being adopted by Parliament, thereby becoming a mandatory circular/decreed for all districts

in Tajikistan. Experiences from O2 have already under TAPRI been adapted and replicated in Khatlon province. However, a challenge will be to cover all jamoats and mahallas. The TF can be significantly upscaled, both in terms of larger geographical coverage and increased funding for individual oblasts and districts. In the case of the latter, care should be taken to ensure that government contributions can ensure ownership, and to avoid infrastructure sub-projects beyond the local O&M capacity.

#### **1.4 Main recommendations and lessons learned**

A range of recommendations and lessons learned are presented throughout the report and compiled in Chapter 5.2 Recommendation and Chapter 5.3 Lessons learned. The most important ones are synthesised and presented below:

##### **Recommendations:**

- Prepare a sustainability/hand-over plan for O2, which should be implemented from the onset of any follow-up programming. Such a plan should be a requirement of any extension provided to O2, or parts of O2, including the TF.
- Further strengthen the capacity to coherently address BEE and crosscutting issues (e.g. environment, disaster risk reduction, climate change, gender, migration, conflict prevention) in DDPs, including formulating priority actions that address the issues identified.
- Continue TF but with increasing government contribution from oblast and districts (in per cent and actual figures) for each round.
- Conduct an independent and in-depth audit of TF incl. sub-projects, so government can prove is capacity to handle donor funds.
- Ensure that a future TF much larger extent finances “soft” sub-projects, sub-projects addressing crosscutting issues, and projects specifically targeting BEE.
- Include in TF modalities mandatory environmental screenings/impact assessments and environmental mitigation plans.
- Broaden the support for DP implementation to go beyond TF, and providing capacity building, TA and mentoring in relation to projects for which districts and jamoats have secured funding elsewhere.
- Build on the experiences from UNDP/TajWSS pilot projects with tariffs and cost recovery in relation to TF sub-projects and DPs.
- Include in MEDT methodology an analysis of the level of infrastructure coverage a district has the economic and technical capacity to maintain.
- Continue support for, and upscaling of, the BEE sub-component, especially district PPDs and LEPI.
- Link PPD to DDP process as a means to enhance private sector participation in the planning.
- Efforts to upscale/replicate O2 (e.g. DP process, TF) should take the local capacity and context into consideration, e.g. in relation to the planning of technical support.

##### **Lessons learned:**

- The logical connection between outputs within projects must be sufficient and practical – otherwise it may be better to split the programme into more projects.
- Capacity building and support for the preparation of local DPs can be relatively inexpensive.
- Support to more than one round of DDPs and JDPs enhances the understanding by local stakeholders of the process, DP quality and the ability to continue process without donor support.
- The availability of (good) DDPs enhances the ability to mobilise funds from multiple sources. But the potential for implementing DDPs and mobilising funds is highly uneven among districts; this needs to be factored into the planning.
- Strong effort must be put into ensuring there is a good local understanding of the importance of “soft” issues, as well as BEE and crosscutting issues, and how these can be addressed. Otherwise, there is a likelihood of crosscutting being merely being mentioned without being analysed and tackled in a systematic and comprehensive manner. This includes building an understanding of when soft responses are better or more cost-effective than infrastructure, otherwise local stakeholders will tend to focus on infrastructure.
- A continued focus must be kept on ensuring participation of stakeholders outside government, especially private sector.
- The quality of JDPs is primarily shaped by a) the quality of the training and TA provided by consultants, and b) the capacity of district governments to support jamoats. This should be duly factored into the planning of support for jamoats.
- Local governments, especially oblast authorities, have the capacity to manage donor funding.
- TF is a powerful incentive mechanism for preparation and implementation of local development plans, which can build strong local ownership of a decentralised and participatory/inclusive development planning process.
- Significant contributions in cash and in kind can be raised for TF sub-project implementation, but the contributions vary significantly among districts).
- Sufficient time should be allowed for sub-project implementation to ensure that quality is not compromised.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation of Output 2 (O2) of the Rural Growth Programme (RGP) is to: a) provide an independent analysis of the relevance, implementation efficiency, impact, and sustainability of RGP O2; and b) capture lessons learned to inform future programme design and implementation in Tajikistan – especially for programmes under the UNDP Communities Programme (CP). This includes highlighting possibilities for replication and scaling-up, and lessons for adjusting similar activities under projects related to achieving improved governance and institutional capital to promote local development.

The objective of the evaluation is to assess implementation progress and achievements against the targets set for O2, with special emphasis on: a) evaluating the relevance, sustainability and impact of new approaches piloted and their contribution to achieving the overall RGP objective; and b) evaluating the extent to which links with national development strategies and priorities, and synergies with the development priorities pursued by the Tajikistan Development Coordination Council (DCC), were achieved. This includes assessing efficiency with which O2 has been achieved, and its relevance to the overall aim of promoting local and rural development in Sughd.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation is provided in Annex 1.

### 2.2 Approach and methodology

The evaluation approach comprised the following main elements:

- A review of relevant documentation (a full list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex 4)
- Group and individual interviews with key stakeholders at national, oblast (region), rayon (district), jamoat (sub-district), and mahalla (community) level. Stakeholders interviewed include government at all levels, community representatives and members, small-scale private enterprises, NGOs, and international agencies (Annex 3 provides a full list of people interviewed)
- Visits to selected Trust Fund (TF) co-financed sub-projects in Sughd Oblast (Annex 2 provides the evaluation mission programme)
- Analysis and report writing

The evaluation was carried out as a final/post-implementation evaluation; O2 implementation was completed by 31 June 2013, whereas other components of RGP were completed on 31 December 2012.

### 2.3 Key questions, scope and limitations of the evaluation

The evaluation covers all activities carried out by the UNDP's CP in Sughd Oblast under O2 during the period January 2010 – June 2013. The ToR specify evaluation shall use the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. UNDP's "Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results" specifies that UNDP

evaluations generally should apply the OECD/DAC criteria. The definitions of the criteria provided in the ToR essentially correspond with the definitions in UNDP's handbook (Annex 10 provides an overview of UNDP and OECD/DAC criteria definitions). In line with these criteria, the ToR provide a series of questions for the evaluation to assess; Annex 7 provides the full list of questions as well as the evaluation findings/answers to these.

The evaluation also assessed the extent to which the implementation of O2 considered and addressed the crosscutting issues of environmental sustainability, gender equity, disaster risk reduction, and migration.

The main limitations influencing the evaluation were the following:

- Language – most stakeholders speak only Tajik and Russian and much O2 documentation is available only in these languages. The international consultant did not speak or read these languages. This limitation was mitigated by the presence of a national consultant on the evaluation team and translations done during interviews and meetings by translators and UNDP/programme staff.
- Time – due to time constraints only a sample of rayons, jamoats, mahallas, and sub-project sites were visited.
- Documentation availability – numerous documents were provided by UNDP reviewed, but some documents were not assessed, such as training materials for some training modules, TF proposals which were not funded, raw monitoring and baseline data, and some calculations (e.g. on rates of returns of investments).

## 3 Description of RGP O2

### 3.1 Background and context

Tajikistan is the poorest of the former Soviet Republics; and while the country has experienced high economic growth rates and falling poverty levels, the poverty rate was still 38% in 2012 and Tajikistan ranked 127 on the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI). Since independence, the country's economy has undergone significant changes. The private sector contribution to the economy in Tajikistan is fairly modest; and accounts for around 49% of the GDP (2012). Agriculture remains the primary sector in the national economy; it accounts for around 65% of employment and contributes with 20% of GDP and export revenues.

However, the agricultural sector's productivity is significantly limited by a number of factors, such as the inability to maintain the substantial productive infrastructure of the Soviet Union. Other constraints affecting the private sector are issues related to the business environment, such as taxes; while the business environment in Tajikistan has improved in recent years, it still ranked 141 on the World Bank Doing Business Index in 2013.

Seen in this light it is not surprising that the private sector in general, and agriculture in particular, is unable to generate sufficient employment and attractive salaries/income levels. Hence, labour migration is very high, and in 2012, remittances accounted for 47% of the GDP. Another issue related to infrastructural constraints is a need for enhanced social services, especially in rural areas.

Tajikistan is in an ongoing governance reform process of a) decentralisation and b) improving the business environment. A series of policy and legal reforms have been implemented, or are being implemented in under the overall framework of the National Development Strategy (NDS) for 2007-2015. Annex 6 provides a brief overview of the key policies, strategies, laws and acts in this context.

However, due to limited capacity of local governments and financial constraints as well as a culture/tradition of centralised/top-down decision-making, these changes are not yet fully rolled out at the local level, and local governments have not been able to fully assume their new and enhanced roles and mandates. One key constraint in this context is that the planning process, which is being decentralised, is not properly linked to the budgeting process, which currently remains centralised.

The ongoing reform process is supported by the international donor community. The first pillar of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Tajikistan is *poverty reduction and governance*, with the intended outcome: “*Good governance and economic and social growth are jointly enhanced to reduce poverty, unlock human potential, protect rights and improve core public functions*”. UNDP's work focuses on five practice areas, including poverty reduction and good governance.



### 3.2 The Rural Growth Programme (RGP)

The Rural Growth Programme (RGP) in Sughd Oblast was a DFID, UNDP and GIZ funded three-year initiative. It was implemented in 2010-2012 (except O2, which was given an extension till 30 June 2013) in 14 rural districts and 65 jamoats of Sughd Oblast by UNDP and GIZ with the involvement of other partners and sub-contractors.

The programme was intended to contribute to the following goal (impact): *“More inclusive economic development in rural areas of Tajikistan in support of the Government’s National Development Strategy (NDS) and the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS)”*.

The purpose (expected outcome) of RGP was: *“Local environment for income generation and employment creation in Sughd Oblast, including for women and poor enhanced”*.

The programme consisted of the following outputs:

1. The RGP inception phase is completed
2. **Improving capacities of local governance actors (particularly at rayon and jamoat levels) for local development planning with an emphasis on rural economic growth, including the implementation and monitoring of local development plans in line with NDS and PRS**
3. Facilitating access for producers/farmers and MSMEs to appropriate, professional, and sustainable business and technical advisory/extension services
4. Supporting organised member focused business associations and their apex institutions in developing adequate and responsive services and advocacy support for its members
5. Strengthening local vocational training institutions to meet local, regional and international market demands for better qualified labour and safe migration
6. Facilitating access for producers/farmers, poor, women, and MSMEs to a variety of financial products and services available from Microfinance Institutions (MFIs)

UNDP was the lead implementing partner for O2, whereas GIZ was leading the implementation of Outputs 3-6.

### 3.3 Output 2 (O2) rationale and intervention logic

O2 differed from the other outputs by focusing on strengthening local government’s capacity. The rationale behind this output vis-à-vis the goal and purpose of RGP was that local governments play an important role in creating a conducive/enabling environment for private sector investments and activities, income generation and job creation, and overall economic development. O2 had broader focus than the other outputs, as it embraced a more holistic approach by acknowledging that local government planning and priorities also include provision of social services, which again can be seen as a prerequisite for maintaining a skilled, healthy and productive labour force. Hence, while the output did have a focus on economic activities, it also

worked at enabling local governments to develop comprehensive and holistic development plans (DPs) covering both income generation and social needs – or more broadly building the institutional and social capital for achieving local development.

O2 comprised three sub-components/legs:

4. Support to participatory planning at the oblast, district and jamoat level and formulation of development plans for these three levels. This involved the revision and implementation of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade's (MEDT) planning methodology, with a focus on activities to achieve economic development at the oblast, district and Jamoat levels. UNDP partnered with the Mountain Society Development Support (MSDSP) programme of Aga Khan Foundation (AKF) to introduce village development planning processes, through working with local community organisations (mahalla committees).
5. Support to implementing selected priorities outlined in the district and jamoat development plans (DDPs and JDPs), through a Trust Fund (TF) mechanism jointly managed with oblast and district authorities to fund projects selected through the use of specific criteria to ensure that they were relevant to, and could contribute to, local economic development.
6. Support to enhancing institutional capacity at the local level for creation of a more favourable business-enabling environment (BEE), through piloting and introduction of e-governance elements, introducing and promoting sustainable district level platforms for public-private dialogue (PPD), and capacity building activities for public authorities to improve their understanding of the tools and mechanisms at their disposal for promoting local economic development.

The O2 part of the logframe (March 2012 revision) is presented in Annex 11. Annex 5 provides an overview of the main activities implemented under O2.

The implementation of O2 was extended till 30 June 2013, to enable full completion and handover of TF sub-projects, to carry out this external evaluation and gather and communicate the results and lessons learned.

### **3.4 RGP O2 management and implementation arrangements**

A Programme Steering Committee (PSC) comprising representatives of Sughd Oblast authorities, MEDT, the Ministry of Agriculture, the State Committee for Investments and State Property Management, DFID, UNDP, and GIZ provided strategic overall oversight and guidance to RGP; the PSC met twice annually.

UNDP was responsible for coordinating overall delivery of the RGP. This was done through the UNDP Communities Programme (CP). RGP was implemented through UNDP's Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). UNDP recruited an international Programme Coordinator, who divided her work time equally between UNDP and GIZ components; the Programme Coordinator was based in Dushanbe, but spent a significant amount of time in Khujand working with UNDP and GIZ area offices (AOs).

UNDP led the implementation of Output 2; Outputs 3-6 were led by GIZ, but UNDP also implemented activities under these outputs.

The UNDP CP Team in Dushanbe provided support for RGP, and especially for O2, including technical and management support, administration and financial controls, as well as leading activities and dialogue at national level. UNDP's AOs in Khujand and Ayni were responsible for overall programme coordination, implementation, planning and reporting for interventions in their respective areas of operation; Khujand AO covered oblast level activities and 11 districts, whereas Ayni AO covered three districts.

Sughd Oblast and each district had a Working Group (WG) for DP development; these WGs were led by the oblast/district chairperson and comprised members from all relevant departments, as well as representatives of lower level government (district representatives in oblast WG, jamoat representatives in district WGs), and representatives from private sector and civil society. The oblast and districts authorities led the implementation of their respective DPs.

The Trust Fund (TF) was led by an oblast level Evaluation Committee comprising two representatives from the oblast authorities, one private sector representative, one civil society representative, and one donor representative. This group would evaluate and select sub-project proposals for TF funding, based on TF guidelines and evaluation criteria. Prior to submission to the TF, district WGs would have screened and selected proposals for submission. District governments were responsible for the implementation of the funded sub-projects. TF funds were managed by the oblast under a letter of agreement with UNDP. Districts manage funds granted for their sub-projects. Tendering was done in accordance with government procedures.

The Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT) refined their development planning methodology with support from UNDP. MEDT houses a consultant team, which provided ToT (training of trainers) on oblast, districts and rayons on development planning, M&E, budgeting, and other topics. Some of the consultants on the team are recruited by UNDP, others by MEDT. The trainers trained came from private sector and NGOs, and provided direct training for district and jamoat authority staff.

IOM implemented activities related to migration, and the Mountain Societies Development Support Programme (MSDSP) of the Aga Khan Foundation (AKF) implemented activities and training to build mahalla/community level activities, such as the preparation of village development plans (VDCs) and sub-project proposals.

### 3.5 Main stakeholders

The table below provides a brief overview of the role of different stakeholders in O2.

Stakeholder	Involvement in RGP O2
-------------	-----------------------

Sughd Oblast/regional government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading the development of the oblast development plan (ODP)</li> <li>• Leading and co-funding the TF</li> <li>• Leading oblast level PPD</li> <li>• Providing support to districts</li> <li>• Managing oblast website with e-governance elements</li> </ul>
14 district/rayon governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading the development and implementation of DDPs, with selected inputs from JDPs</li> <li>• Developing and submitting proposals for TF funding</li> <li>• Screening/assessing, selection for submission and supporting rayon developed TF proposals</li> <li>• Leading implementation of TF sub-projects – usually providing some co-funding</li> <li>• Leading district level PPDs (in three pilot districts)</li> <li>• Managing district websites with e-governance elements</li> </ul>
65 sub-district/jamoat authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading the development of JDPs, with inputs from VDPs</li> <li>• Selecting and submitting TF proposal concepts to district government</li> <li>• Managing jamoat level TF sub-projects (e.g. waste management, water supply)</li> </ul>
226 mahalla committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading the development of VDPs</li> <li>• Proposing TF proposal concepts to jamoats</li> <li>• Managing mahalla level TF sub-projects (e.g. sewing centres, bakeries)</li> </ul>
MEDT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and revision of development planning methodology</li> <li>• Providing technical support to local governments, incl. ToT and comments on DPs</li> </ul>
Institute for Civil Servant Training (ICST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training civil servants at all levels on development planning methodology</li> </ul>
Private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participating in WGs</li> <li>• Participating in PPDs</li> <li>• Represented in TF evaluation committee</li> <li>• Contributing in cash and in kind to DP implementation and TF sub-projects (e.g. dehkan farmers in relation to irrigation structures or bridges, provision o construction materials)</li> <li>• Contracted service providers to O2 implementation (e.g. construction work on infrastructure sub-projects, trainers, consultants) – contracted by UNDP, MEDT, oblast and district governments</li> </ul>
Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participating in hearings related to DPs</li> <li>• Contributing in cash and in kind to DP implementation and TF sub-projects (e.g. “hashar “labour, financial contributions incl. from remittances)</li> </ul>
Civil society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participating in WGs</li> <li>• Represented in TF evaluation committee</li> <li>• Service providers (e.g. trainers, IOM activities, website development by VIT-Kova) – contracted by UNDP, IOM, MEDT</li> </ul>
UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• O2 implementing agency/lead</li> <li>• Programme management, monitoring, quality assurance, financial management</li> <li>• Training and TA</li> <li>• Contracting service providers</li> <li>• Dialogue with government and donors</li> <li>• Donor to O2</li> </ul>

GIZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited involvement in O2</li> <li>• Facilitating establishment of oblast PPD (under Output 4)</li> <li>• Supported de formulation of oblast fruit and vegetables strategy, which linked to ODP</li> </ul>
DFID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal donor to RGP and O2</li> </ul>
AKF/MSDSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building and training for selected mahalla committee, e.g. on management and on VDPs</li> <li>• Facilitating inclusion of VDP priorities in JDPs</li> <li>• Support for the development and implementation of TF sub-projects at mahalla level</li> </ul>
IOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing migration related activities</li> <li>• Directly supported inclusion of migration in five DDPs</li> <li>• Training for oblast and district government on migration issues</li> <li>• Training of, and counselling for, communities on migration issues and investment of remittances in productive assets</li> </ul>
UNDP-UNEP PEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used RGP and O2 as implementation vehicle in Tajikistan</li> <li>• Provided cofounding for poverty-environment sub-projects under the TF</li> <li>• Mainstreamed environment into DP methodology</li> <li>• Assisted with inclusion of environment in TF criteria</li> </ul>
UN Women	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening of 2 DDPs for gender inclusion and introduction of gender indicators</li> </ul>

## 4 Findings

### 4.1 Programme coordination, administration, and implementation

#### 4.1.1 Partnerships and linkages

As can be seen for the above description of the O2 management and implementation modalities and stakeholder list, UNDP utilised partnerships and contractual agreements for implementation with a number of partners from the government, other UN organisations, civil society, and private sector. It is the impression of the evaluation team that overall the partnerships worked well and were well coordinated. The responsibilities of the partners in O2 were well defined, mutually supportive and not overlapping; and they enabled O2 to 1) cover all levels of local governance and planning, from oblast level, to district and jamoat level, and down to community level, and b) address crosscutting issues, such as migration, gender, disaster risk reduction, and environment.

Furthermore, the respective key expertise of the international organisations was utilised, and drew on experiences and methodologies they had developed in other programmes and projects. For example, the approach used by MSDSP/AKF for building the capacity and structure of mahalla committees is derived from MSDSP community-based interventions elsewhere in Tajikistan, and after the completion of mahalla level O2 activities in February 2012, MSDSP/AKF continued work under the DFID funded *Strengthening Civil Society Organisations in Sughd Oblast* project.

In addition to these partnership synergies, UNDP has linked RGP O2 with the implementation of other UNDP programmes in different ways:

- **UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI):** In Tajikistan, this global policy initiative utilised RGP O2 as a vessel for implementation and as an entry point to promote the mainstreaming of poverty-environment issues into local development planning. The key areas of PEI inputs to O2 included mainstreaming of poverty-environment aspects into DDPs and JDPs, financing six environment TF sub-projects, and including environment criteria in TF guidelines.
- **Aid for Trade (AFT):** This initiative is mainly linked to other RGP outputs. In relation to O2, collaboration included support for the formulation of a trade development strategy for Sughd Oblast (which was linked to the ODP), expert advice for the ODP formulation, training for local government staff on trade issues to consider in DPs, preparation of a Sughd guide for investors, and facilitating legal input for the oblast to analyse the implications of the new tax law.
- **Zerafshan Valley Initiative (ZVI):** ZVI predates RGP and worked in three districts of Sughd; and assisted MEDT in developing the first DP methodology. The DP methodology used in O2 was a revised version of that of ZVI. The districts covered by ZVI developed their second DDPs under O2.
- **National development indicators:** UNDP supports central government (MEDT, National Statistics Agency) in the elaboration of national

development indicators for the NDS and PRS and a national monitoring system. Experiences from RGP O2 feeds into this work.

- Tajikistan Afghanistan Poverty Reduction Initiative (TAPRI): This initiative builds on the experience from O2 and ZVI and supports the elaboration of DDPs in Khatlon oblast.
- Communities Programme (CP)/MEDT consultant team: This team provides capacity building and TA in collaboration with MEDT staff for development planning and implementation and M&E nationwide at both national and local levels, as well as support for budgeting. The team was established in 2008 and has been involved in different programmes, including RGP O2, PEI, ZVI and TAPRI.

However, while O2 was generally very well connected with other UNDP programmes and significant synergies were created; there is one UNDP programme, where potential opportunities were not utilised. As described later in this report, a challenge for the sustainability of infrastructure sub-projects is the centralised establishment of tariffs. UNDPs Tajikistan Water Supply and Sanitation project (TajWSS) works at the policy level to address this issue; it is also piloting tariffs setting and cost recovery on the ground, including in Sughd. However, TajWSS' experiences and approach to tariffs was not into account in the infrastructure (especially water) TF sub-projects in RGP O2.

A significant challenge faced by UNDP and GIZ was to coordinate and create synergies in the implementation of the different RGP Outputs (the coordination between the two agencies appears to have worked well within each outputs). Considering that the implementation of O2 and the other outputs were led by two different agencies and that the key audience (with O2 primarily working with local government and GIZ working mainly with private sector partners) was different, the actual scope for collaboration across Outputs seems to have been limited. One could argue that the UNDP and GIZ Outputs were de-facto two different projects, where each agency worked on issues related to their core competencies (UNDP – good governance for economic development, GIZ – private sector development). Hence, rather than being a collaboration weakness, the issue appears to be a shortcoming in the RGP design logic. The Outputs do contribute logically to the same high-level outcome and impact in the Logframe, and one could say that O2 was to enable government to provide an enabling environment and productive infrastructure for the other Outputs. But in practical terms the justification and benefits for having them combined in one programme appears insufficient – a more loose collaboration would have been more appropriate. Combining UNDP and GIZ's Outputs in one programme appears to have been driven by DFID rather than on a mutual understanding and logic between UNDP, GIZ and other stakeholders.

Due to the joint programme both agencies felt obliged to attempt to closely coordinate efforts when there was limited basis for doing so, which seems to have create some tension and frustration. However, part of the tension is probably also related to the different mandates of government and private sector – hence, government development plans will inevitably comprise a

strong social element and not exclusively focus on creating a BEE, and this is also reflected in the priority sub-projects proposals submitted for TF support.

Furthermore, having O2 and the GIZ Outputs in the same programme, have also created some tensions in relation to the upcoming Growth in the Rural Economy and Agriculture of Tajikistan programme (GREAT). GREAT is not conceived to be a continuation of RGP, but rather as a private sector focused programme, which builds on the experiences from primarily RGP Outputs 3-6. However, RGP stakeholders, especially government, perceive GREAT as RGP phase 2 and express frustration that O2 activities and in particular the TF are not continued under GREAT.

Notwithstanding the above, there are some areas, where synergies have been created between the Outputs, most notably in relation to a) the oblast PPD established under Output 4 with the district PPDs established under O2, and b) the formulation of an oblast fruit and vegetable strategy, which fed into the ODP development.

Reportedly, O2 coordinated and exchanged information with exchange of information and coordination took place with IFC/the World Bank (on BEE issues), USAID (on local governance and establishing local level entities), and Open Society Institute-Soros Foundation (on E-Governance).

**Conclusions:**

- UNDP has been very successful in creating synergies between RGP O2 other UNDP programmes in terms of: building on experiences, refining methodologies, addressing cross-cutting issues, and utilising existing structures.
- Collaboration with TajWSS on infrastructure TF sub-projects in relation to addressing tariff setting and O&M cost recovery could have benefited sub-projects.
- UNDP and GIZ coordinated efforts, but the scope for this was somewhat limited due to having different national implementing partners.
- The design logic of RGP was not sufficiently strong in practical terms to justify having O2 and Output 3-6 in the same programme. This has created some misunderstandings, tensions and frustrations, e.g. in relation to the role of GREAT and the future of O2.

**Recommendations:**

- Link implementation of DP infrastructure sub-projects to ongoing policy work and piloting under TajWSS in relation to tariff setting and cost recovery.

**Lessons learned:**

- A programme should not be treated as an isolated “island”; significant benefits can be obtained by linking to other programmes and creating synergies.
- When you have a programme multiple partners working on different approaches and with different partners, it is of critical importance to



ensure the overall logic of the programme is strong, also in practical terms. It is equally important to ensure that the partners understand and buy in to this logic and the synergies to be obtained.

#### 4.1.2 Monitoring

Monitoring in the context of O2 comprises a number of elements:

- Monitoring of the achievement of RGP impact (goal) and outcome (purpose)
- Monitoring of O2 implementation progress and results
- Monitoring of the implementation of DPs, mainly at oblast and district levels
- Monitoring of the implementation of TF sub-projects
- Monitoring of socio-economic development and changes at oblast and district levels

RGP goal and purpose: The anticipation that O2 would contribute to the goal/impact and purpose/outcome (pls. refer to Chapter 3.2 and Annex 11) of RGP is sound and logical, but it is very difficult to measure the contribution of O2 to the goal. It is potentially easier, but still difficult, to assess the contribution of O2 to the outcome in relation to the third indicator (May 2012 revision of the logframe): *income generation environment/ business climate in Sughd region*. This indicator was measured in annual business perception surveys, which include perceptions of local government. However, this measurement is soft and based on perceptions rather than tangible evidence of the changes achieved. Unfortunately, the 2012 business perception survey is available only in Russian. It also appears that the first business perception survey was carried out in 2011, and that no baseline business perception survey was carried out during the inception phase. O2 would contribute to the other two outcome indicators, but as for the impact/goal indicator, changes would be very difficult to attribute to O2.

O2 – logframe and indicators: As described in the previous chapter, O2 could de-facto be seen as an individual project. Furthermore, the definition of O2 (*improved capacities of local governance actors (particularly at district and Jamoat levels) for local economic development planning, implementation and monitoring*) could be seen as an outcome in itself, as it indicates a transformative change of government capacity and practice. This, in combination with complexity, wide scope with three sub-components/legs (which well and logically linked to each other), and the large number of activities would merit a full (sub)logframe for O2 alone. Having it as an output with three output oriented indicators (in the May 2012 revised logframe) was thus not sufficient to capture the transformative change O2 is intended to deliver, and the logframe did not provide enough detail to serve as a practical management tool for guiding O2 implementation. The three indicators in the revised logframe captured the number of DPs prepared, number of TF sub-projects implemented and number of BEE initiatives, but not the actual outcomes of O2, such as the extent to which DPs were implemented, the quality of DPs, sub-projects and BEE initiatives, and what they have meant for the local economic (or social) development. Monitoring of sub-project implementation was confined to TF funded sub-projects, and not covering the

implementation of other DP priority projects. The first indicator of the original logframe in the Prodoc was somewhat better suited to capture these aspects. Annex 9 provides the indicators for both versions of the logframe, and Annex 11 provides the full 2012 revised logframe for O2.

O2 – progress monitoring: UNDP and its implementing partners put in significant effort in monitoring O2 beyond the indicators in the logframe, including:

- Monitoring of the progress of activities, e.g. recording the number people trained
- Monitoring the implementation of TF sub-projects (e.g. recording the number of beneficiaries and jobs created), assuring the quality of implementation (e.g. checking procurement processes, UNDP engineers checking infrastructure designs and construction)
- Monitoring the number of jobs created and income generated from TF sub-projects
- Calculation of costs and benefits and rates of returns on investments
- Monitoring the funding mobilised for DDP implementation from multiple sources
- Monitoring new jobs generated and private and agricultural sector turnover
- Building the monitoring capacity of stakeholders, such as oblast and district government and WGs, and mahalla committees (AKF/MSDSP)

As is common in virtually all projects, much of the monitoring was output-oriented; for example, while the number of trained people was recorded, the actual use of the skills imparted was not monitored systematically. Impact oriented data, such as number of new jobs and private sector turnover is very difficult to attribute to the DP process, while it is much easier to attribute to TF sub-projects. On the outcomes, UNDP has carried out calculations of rates of return on investments, jobs created and income changes, but the evaluation team did not have the opportunity to fully review the monitoring data management systems or the basis upon which cost-benefits, rates of returns and impacts were calculated. The Local Economic Performance Indicator (LEPI), which was piloted under O2, could prove a useful tool in monitoring BEE related impacts.

Furthermore, the evaluation team did not have the opportunity to fully review the baseline information and how it was gathered, but other than the baseline information provided in the logframe, which was derived from ZVI and MEDT, the available baseline information appears limited in scope – a baseline or needs analysis report was not prepared other than the information provided in Prodoc and the Inception Report.

Monitoring by local government: Oblast and in particular district government and WGs have the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of DP priorities, including the implementation of TF sub-projects, as well as monitoring national economic development indicators at the local level (see Annex 15, which include a few of these indicators). They carry out monitoring on an ongoing basis as part of their core mandates. However, while they are

generally able to monitor and oversee the implementation of sub-projects, they are still facing some challenges, e.g. in relation to monitoring environmental impacts. Two district deputy chairs interviewed called for more capacity building in monitoring and a consolidated monitoring tool. Another district mentioned that while they had the needed specialists, these were young and somewhat inexperienced.

UNDP provided significant support to districts in monitoring the implementation of TF sub-projects. One district mentioned that the monitoring and supervision of implementation was done in close collaboration with UNDP, with frequent field visits from UNDP specialist. It is the impression of the evaluation team that due to local government capacity constraints and the short timeframe available for TF sub-project implementation, UNDP was very hands-on in monitoring in order to assure sub-project quality – perhaps overly so. District government staff was provided with training/capacity building on monitoring of both project implementation and development indicators, but this was provided during the last six months of O2 implementation.

MEDT provides the overall framework for monitoring economic and social development, and provides monitoring capacity building for local governments (e.g. through training and TA provided by the MEDT/CP consultant team). The Institute for Civil Servants Training (ICST) also provides technical support for local government. Moreover, MEDT carries out periodical monitoring and prepares periodical progress reports on the MDG and NDP indicators, which compile information from oblasts and districts. In this regards, local governments provide quarterly progress reports to MEDT.

### **Conclusions:**

- The RGP logframe did not provide sufficient detail to serve as a management tool guiding the implementation of O2.
- The O2 indicators in the logframe were output oriented and did not capture transformational changes, outcomes and impacts achieved by O2.
- UNDP carried out a significant amount of monitoring of O2 progress and also captured some economic outcomes, although much monitoring was output oriented.
- The oblast and districts monitor the implementation of their DPs and sub-project implementation, but are still facing capacity constraints in relation to M&E.
- Due to local government capacity constraints and limited time available for implementation, UNDP was very, and perhaps overly so, hands-on in TF sub-project monitoring.
- LEPI could prove a useful tool in monitoring changes in the BEE.

### **Recommendations:**

- For programmes with a DP component, prepare a full (sub)logframe for the component, with impact/outcome oriented indicators, and adequate detail to be used as a management tool to guide implementation – even if this goes beyond donor requirements.

- Measure outcome/impact oriented indicators, which can capture transformational change/outcomes and be attributed to the DPP process (e.g. numbers of jobs created and amount of income generated directly as a result of DP priorities implemented (not only for TF sub-projects), the quality of DPs in terms of identifying and addressing key issues including crosscutting issues).
- Measure the quality and relevance of activities implemented (e.g. actual use of skills imparted through trainings).
- Develop a mentoring methodology for ensuring that local governments and stakeholders can monitor sub-project implementation and for gradually phasing out UNDP M&E – hence striking a balance of ensuring sufficient quality without UNDP getting too hands-on in the monitoring.
- Provide further capacity building for local governments and stakeholders on M&E of both project implementation and development indicators.
- Keep copies of both approved and rejected TF proposals in the files of oblast and UNDP.
- Bring urgently together the RGP team (UNDP, implementing partners, government) for a lessons learned analysis workshop, which can feed into the planned lessons learned report.

#### **Lessons learned:**

- The logical connection between outputs within projects must be sufficient and practical – otherwise it may be better to split into more projects.
- Care should be taken to ensure that indicators monitored capture key outcomes and impacts.
- It is important to have a mix of quantitative progress indicators and indicators that capture the quality and relevance of activities.
- Building the M&E capacity of local stakeholders is important – monitoring should be done with them and the full responsibility for monitoring should gradually be transferred to them.

#### **4.1.3 Budget and spending**

The total budget allocated in the Prodoc for O2 was USD 4,612,494:

- USD 2,820,000 (61%) from DFID
- USD 1,605,282 from UNDP
- USD 187,212 from GIZ

In reality, the total budget made available for UNDP for O2 implementation was USD 4,583,392.

- USD 2,983,392 (65%) from DFID
- USD 1,600,000 from UNDP
- USD 0 from GIZ

In By March 2013, USD 4,408,094 (96% of the UNDP managed budget) had been spent.

The single largest expenditure line was the TF, which received USD 2,100,000 or 46% of the total budget. Other major expenditure items are:

- Funding for IOM implemented activities on labour migration: USD 472,904
- Support to formulation of 8 DDPs and updating of 6 DDPs: USD 353,803
- Programme staff costs: USD 244,961
- Technical advisor on local governance: USD 217,852
- Mahalla level capacity building (in 6 districts) by AKF/MSDSP: USD 204,560
- Enhancing district level (Statistics Agency): USD 144,203
- Support to formulation of 65 jamoat development plans: USD 87,251

A detailed financial report for O2 is available in Annex 12. Generally speaking, actual spending against budget items was fairly in line with the allocated budgets. The only areas where significant deviations from the budget were found are:

- Programme staff costs: USD 244,961 – no funding was allocated for this originally
- Funding for IOM implemented activities on labour migration: USD 472,904 – the original budget was USD 300,000
- Monitor of and provide technical support to the implementation of the projects approved under the Trust Fund 2nd cycle – out of the USD 131,455 allocated, only USD 123,902 were spent as of March 2013, but considering the timing of the TF second round, this low spending is probably due to the date of the financial report

All other deviations from the budget were less than USD 40,000.

The funds spent on the budget items on support to the formulation of DDPs and JDPs are very low compared to the number of districts and jamoats covered, but it should be noted that several of the other cost items covered capacity building and other costs, which were prerequisites for the preparation of DPs. If it is assumed that the entire O2 budget was spent on items needed for district, jamoat and mahalla level capacity building and DP preparation, the average cost per district would be approximately USD 330,000. If the TF funding is excluded from this, the average cost would be around USD 175,000 per district. In reality, the costs would be less, as this estimate also includes work at the Oblast level and BEE activities. The evaluation team could not make a more precise estimate of the costs, as the budget was not disaggregated by sub-components and the related activities.

In addition to the USD 2,100,000 provided by UNDP and DFID, PEI provided USD 50,000 (for the first round of the TF), earmarked for poverty-environment related sub-projects.

### **Conclusions:**

- The funding provided for O2 has been spent within the implementation period.
- The allocated budget for O2 has generally been spent in accordance with the provisions in the budget of the Prodoc.

- The average UNDP/DFID costs for capacity building and support for the preparation of local development plans (DDPs and JDPs for some of the jamoats) in the district is less than USD 175.000 per district.

#### **Lessons:**

- Capacity building and support for the preparation of local DPs can be relatively inexpensive.

## **4.2 Progress and results**

A detailed overview of the outputs and results achieved under O2 is presented in annex 5.

### **4.2.1 Support to development planning**

The target associated with the development planning sub-component in the logframe was achieved; 14 DDPs and 65 JDPs were developed and the ODP (Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan) for 2012-2015 was updated. However, this indicator far from captures the full range of work carried out and results achieved under this sub-component.

National level: MEDT has the mandate to support the DP process and was the principal partner for work at the national level. The national level work was facilitated/led by the MEDT/CP consultant team. Key areas of O2 work at this level for the development planning sub-component comprised:

- Revising and updating MEDT's DP methodology based on the experiences at district level (methodology originally developed with UNDP support through other programmes, such as ZVI)
- Development of training packages targeting local governments on planning, local economic development (LED), investment promotion, resource mobilization, PPD, environment, and computer literacy – and, in the last six months of O2 implementation, on M&E
- ToT on DDP and JDP development for the Institute for Civil Servant Training (ICST), oblast government, district governments, consultants in the districts, NGOs (especially AKF)
- Provision of training for district governments through two trainer teams formed (one for districts, one for jamoats) and ICST – reportedly, a total of 5,000 people were trained in development planning. Jamoats were only trained from 2012
- Provision of TA/mentoring for districts
- Reviewing and commenting on draft DDPs
- Provision of inputs and recommendation for new/revised laws and policies guiding local governance
- Inclusion of training on the DP methodology in ICST's core curriculum

Some of the most significant changes made to MEDT's DP methodology were the following:

- Decentralisation of the DDP approval to districts themselves and transformation of the role of MEDT to an advisory one
- Introduction of a bottom-up multi-level approach, where mahallas and jamoats identify their priorities, which feed into the district development planning process

- Inclusion of crosscutting issues in the methodology: environment, gender, conflict prevention, disaster risks reduction, and migration
- Integration of LED in development planning

The training materials developed are not available in English, but it is the impression of the evaluation team that the materials (on M&E and proposal development) are relevant and of good quality. However, they do not specifically reflect/include the formats used in RGP, e.g. for DPs, TF sub-project proposals, and monitoring.

Oblast level: Under this sub-component, work focused on revising the ODP (Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan). This plan was not translated to English. The RGP mid-term review in 2011 found that the ODP did not sufficiently include priorities from the DDPs, but UNDP and the oblast government did not agree with this comment, as the purpose of the ODP is to provide a strategic regional level perspective rather than being a synthesis of DDPs – hence the ODP also provides strategic direction for the DDPs. The ODP was revised after the MTR. One district mentioned that ODP priorities, e.g. to increase potato production was included in their DDP. Furthermore, the oblast commented on DDPs and contributed to district capacity building and TA.

District level: This level was central for RGP. District government is the lowest level of government with a cadre of technical staff and (for now) the lowest level with its own budget, although most of the budget is spent on running costs and salaries, so only limited resources are available for investments. District governments also have the responsibility to prepare and implement plans for local economic and social development. Moreover, they have the responsibility for procurement and contract management for local level public investments. Key areas of O2 work at this level for the development planning sub-component comprised:

- Training and capacity building on the topics for district government staff and DDP WGs (for training topics, see above on national level work)
- Awareness raising, consultations, meetings and hearings for local stakeholders (jamoats, communities, private sector, civil society) carried out by district governments
- Support and TA by district government to jamoats for JDP preparation
- Preparation of DDPs by WGs (lead by district governments) taking jamoat priorities and stakeholder feedback into consideration
- Resource mobilisation/fundraising by district governments for implementation of DDP priority projects
- Implementation of DDP priorities by district governments

A key feature of the DDP process used in O2 is the emphasis on transparency and inclusion/participation of local stakeholders. DDP WGs comprised a mix of district government staff (e.g. from the various technical departments) and representatives from jamoats, private sector, and civil society. DDPs took departure in jamoat priorities/JDPs, with selected key priorities from the JDPs being incorporated in the DDPs. Consultations and hearings were an important part of the process. Several of the stakeholders

interviewed highlighted the transparency and the consultation with stakeholders as key features of the DP process; one District government staff and WG member said: *“Now all problems and priorities [in the DDP] come directly from the jamoats...In our opinion the most particular thing of this project is that we rely on people’s priorities and work with people”*. Nonetheless, according to several stakeholders interviewed there is still room for further improvements in relation to ensuring participation, particularly in relation to the participation of the private sector (especially medium to large scale companies). It is the impression of the evaluation team that in some districts the planning process was driven by a few individuals from district government, rather than the entire WG.

Although all 14 DDP WGs had 1-3 private sector members, their active participation appears to have been somewhat limited. Reportedly, there was an initial reluctance from the government side to involve private sector. From the private sector side there was a reluctance to invest time in the DDP process, reservations against government, and the private sector was not sufficiently organised. The fact the WG meetings took place during business hours was reportedly also not conducive for active private sector participation. Nonetheless, RGP has reportedly managed to facilitate improved relation between the public and private sector, but the process of creating mutual trust appears still to be ongoing.

Not surprisingly for a fundamentally new approach the quality of DDPs appears to vary. The DDPs generally follow the same format, which is also in line with the structure of the PRS, and are thus quite comprehensive in their thematic coverage. Issues include:

- A tendency to focus on “hard” infrastructure construction/rehabilitation rather than “soft” aspects (e.g. capacity building, management issues) in the identified priority actions
- Shortcomings in the coverage of crosscutting issues, e.g. the linkage between environmental issues identified and priority actions is not sufficiently strong (more detail is provided in Chapter 4.2.4 Crosscutting issues)
- Lack of analysis of the level of infrastructure that the district and stakeholders are realistically able to maintain – seen in the light of the high interest in rehabilitating the large amount of defunct infrastructure of the Soviet times, while the economic capacity for operation and maintenance (O&M) today is much lower than that of the former Soviet Union
- One district deputy chairperson mentioned that there was a tendency to focus on projects with a short term perspective rather than projects that seem less attractive but have a more long term perspective – and called for training on a methodology for choosing priority projects

The implementation of DDPs developed is carried out by the districts themselves. RGP O2 has provided some support for implementation of a few DDP priorities under the TF, but most of the DDP implementation and resource mobilisation is carried out by the districts themselves. On average, 47% of the DDPs were implemented (realised funding vis-à-vis DPP budget),



but the extent to which plans have been implemented varies significantly from 12% to 69% among 13 of the 14 districts (data for Isfara is missing due to adoption of the Isfara DDP in 2012). These differences reflect that: a) the districts are very different in population size and economic capacity due to differences in market access and private sector presence, and b) that the DDP budgets and number of priority projects in DDPs vary significantly (from TJS 50,645,600 to TJS 1,818,834,900, and from 85 to 249 projects). A detailed overview of the implementation status for the DDPs is provided in Annex 14.

Funding was secured from multiple sources: from district governments' own budgets, from oblast, from central ministries, from private sector (in cash and in kind, e.g. materials, use of vehicles), from communities (in cash but in particular in kind, e.g. "hashar" labour), from NGOs, from a range of international donors/organisations, and from foreign private investors. However, the capacity to mobilise funding varied significantly among districts. As can be seen from the table below, the funding mix also varied greatly.

**Table: DDP contributions from stakeholders (percentage of DDP funding mobilised)**

Source	Min	Max	Average
District governments	0.1%	6.7%	1.2%
Oblast government	0.1%	78.2%	3.2%
Central government	0.4%	30.2%	2.7%
Enterprises	0.0%	33.9%	2.5%
Communities and entrepreneurs	0.1%	78.6%	19.6%
Foreign investors	1.6%	97.5%	69.1%
International donors	0.4%	16.7%	1.7%

It should in this context be noted that Panjakent district was able to raise TJS 1,129,751,600 (USD 236,974,368) from foreign investors (especially Chinese mining investors) – the total funding mobilised by all 13 districts is TJS 1,791,436,720 (USD 375,768,075) – hence, the foreign direct investment in Panjakent alone accounts for 63% of all the funding mobilised; this single post is of course having a dramatic influence on the figures presented in the table and in Annex 14.

Nonetheless, according to calculations made by the MEDT/CP consultant team, districts with DDPs are able to raise much more funding than districts without DDPs.

UNDP estimates that for every USD invested in DDPs, the return of investment is USD 99 but the evaluation team has not seen the calculations carried out.

Jamoat level: Although the 2009 Law on Village Self-governance Bodies is providing an enhanced mandate for jamoat authorities and specifying they should have their own budget, the jamoat authorities do not yet have the capacity to effectively carry out their new mandate, and they have not yet been provided with their own budgets. Jamoats authorities only have funding

ensured for running costs such as salaries. Furthermore, they do not have technical experts employed. Therefore, jamoats depend on district governments for financing, technical expertise, and procurement. Key areas of O2 work at this level for the development planning sub-component comprised:

- Training and capacity building on the topics for jamoat authority staff and JDP WGs from 2012 (for training topics, see above on national level work) – provided by district government, consultants and AKF/MSDSP
- Awareness raising, consultations and meetings with local stakeholders (mahalla committees, communities, private sector, civil society) carried out by jamoat authorities
- Support and TA for JDP preparation from district government and consultants
- Preparation of JDPs by WGs taking mahalla priorities and stakeholder feedback into consideration
- Screening by DDP WGs of JDP priorities and inclusion of selected key priorities in DDPs
- Jamoat representation in DDP WGs
- Implementation of JDP priorities in collaboration with district governments
- Provision of equipment (e.g. computers) to jamoats

As with the DDP process, a key element of O2's work at jamoat level is the inclusion of local stakeholders in the planning process; both in terms of jamoat authorities including their constituencies (e.g. mahalla committees) in the JDP planning, but also in terms of including jamoat level priorities in DDPs. Before, jamoats were not involved in planning processes.

As described above, the capacity at jamoat level is much lower than at district level, and the training at jamoat level started later. It is the impression of the evaluation team that jamoat staff does not always have a full understanding of the DP process. Stakeholders interviewed said that jamoats need more support than districts due to capacity constraints and the lack of technical staff, but a challenge in this context is the large number of jamoats.

In this context, it is not surprising that the quality of the JDPs vary. Only one of the JDPs is translated to English. The quality seems to vary by district, which seems to imply that either a) the quality of support from district governments varies, or b) the quality of the support and training provided by local consultants/trainers vary.

The extent to which JDPs have been implemented is not clear to the evaluation team, as no data was available on this. However, considering that the jamoats do not have their own investment budgets, the actual implementation of JDPs to a large extent depends on whether their priorities are included in DDPs and whether they are among the DDP priorities actually being implemented. The extent to which jamoats are able to mobilise funding, e.g. from communities and local private sector, and the implementation of JDP priorities not included in the DDPs is not clear to the evaluation team.

Mahalla/community/village level: Implementation at this level under O2 took place in September 2010 – February 2012 was lead by AKF/MSDSP. In six districts 226 mahalla committees (MCs) from 18 jamoats were targeted; covering a target population of 280,840 people. With the Law on Public Self-activities Bodies from 2008, MCs can register as legal and formal public entities. However, MCs generally do not have management systems and bylaws in place, so they have little capacity to fully take advantage of the new opportunities offered by the law. Key areas of O2 work at this level for the development planning sub-component comprised:

- Awareness raising, consultations and meetings with district and jamoat authorities, MCs and communities
- Trainings for MCs on management, financial management, project design and fundraising, and legal awareness
- Revision of MC institutional and leadership structures and procedures
- Development of tools and training materials (manuals, templates and book) for MC management, village development plan (VDP) development
- Registration of 226 MCs as public self-initiative bodies
- Support and TA for VDP preparation
- Preparation of 226 VDPs
- Establishment of 226 village development funds (VDFs) with member fees and contributions from community members
- Screening by JDP WGs of VDP priorities and inclusion of selected key priorities in JDPs
- Implementation of VDPs with funding from VDFs

The evaluation team did not see any of the VDPs, beyond quick glances during field visits, and they are not available in English. Hence, the quality of the VDPs has not been assessed. On average, one priority project/economic activity from each VDP was implemented with funds from provided buy mahalla members/communities to their VDFs. A total of TJS 2,200,000 (USD 461,467) were collected by VDFs, corresponding to USD 2,042 per mahalla; with a total population in the 226 mahallas of 280,840, this corresponds to an average contribution of USD 1.60 per person. Of these funds TJS 1,700,000 were spend for more than 600 development activities with funds, including both the above-mentioned priority project/economic activities and other activities (e.g. schools and support for poor households).

### **Conclusions:**

- The DP target was achieved; 14 DDPs and 65 JDPs were developed and the ODP (Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan) for 2012-2015 was updated.
- O2 worked on development planning at multiple levels (central, oblast, district, jamoat, mahalla).
- MEDT's DP methodology was revised to be more decentralised, localised, participatory and bottom-up; and cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, disaster risks reduction, conflict prevention, migration) and LED were incorporated.

- O2 has led to a significant change towards more transparent and inclusive planning. However, there is still room for further improvements, e.g. in relation to the private sector.
- DDPs are quite comprehensive in their thematic coverage, but some quality issues remain, including:
  - A tendency to focus on “hard” infrastructure over “soft” management and capacity related aspects
  - Shortcomings in addressing crosscutting issues
  - A tendency to focus on projects with a short term perspective
- 47% of DDPs have on average been implemented, although there is significant variation due to differences in capacities and potential to attract funding from multiple sources (public, private, community, foreign investors, donors).
- Reportedly, districts with DDPs are able to raise much more funding than districts without DDPs.
- UNDP estimates that for every USD invested in DDPs, the return of investment is USD 99.
- The quality of JDPs varies significantly between districts.
- The extent to which JDPs have been implemented, and the ability of jamoat authorities to mobilise funding is not clear to the evaluation team.
- 226 MCs were capacitated and registered as formal public entities.
- All MCs were able to raise funds from members to implement priority projects from their VDPs, albeit the funding raised per person was modest (1.60 USD/person).

### **Recommendations:**

- Include planning, proposal development, monitoring and other formats used by O2 at the local levels in training materials.
- Translate the ODP (Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan) to English.
- Include in MEDT methodology a careful analysis of the level of infrastructure coverage a district (government and other stakeholders) has the economic and technical capacity to maintain.
- Build the WG capacity to better understand and include soft measures in DDP and JDP priorities/projects.
- Include a methodology for choosing priority projects in MEDT methodology, including projects with a long term perspective.
- Further increase the inclusion of private sector in the planning process and enhance the BEE aspects in DPs.
- Look into the way district and consultants support jamoats, and perhaps rotate consultants to ensure a more uniform quality of training.
- Monitor the implementation of, and fund mobilisation for, JDPs and VDPs.
- Strengthen the capacity to address environment and gender in DDPs, including formulating priority actions that address the issues identified.

### **Lessons learned:**

- Being the lowest government level with technical staff and (currently) own financial resources, the district level is a critical level for decentralised planning.
- The potential for implementing DDPs and mobilizing funds is highly uneven among districts; this needs to be factored into the planning – and in the long run in the budget allocations from central government.
- Strong effort must be put into ensuring there is a good local understanding of the importance of soft issues and how these can be addressed. This includes building an understanding of when soft responses are better or more cost-effective than infrastructure.
- The economic implications of maintenance at the strategic/district level must be carefully analysed in relation to infrastructure investments.
- A continued focus must be kept on ensuring participation of stakeholders outside government, especially private sector (medium and large scale).
- It takes time and continued efforts to ensure that an enhanced understanding of crosscutting issues is also translated into coherent responses to these.
- The availability of (good) DDPs enhances the ability to mobilise funds from multiple sources.
- Jamoat capacity in relation to planning and especially implementation remains low. Even if they are provided with their own budget, they lack the technical staff to carry out plans without assistance from districts/higher level government. Capacity building needs at jamoat level is very high, but given the large number of jamoats, reaching them all is a major challenge.
- The quality of JDPs is primarily shaped by a) the quality of the training and TA provided by consultants, and b) the capacity of district governments to support jamoats. This should be duly factored into the planning of support for jamoats.
- Building the capacity at mahalla level enhances the ability of JDPs and VDPs to reflect the situation at the community level and enhances the community voice in the planning process.
- Strengthened MCs and VDFs facilitate the mobilisation of community resources.

#### 4.2.2 Trust fund

The target associated with the TF sub-component in the logframe was significantly surpassed; 131 sub-projects were implemented (63 in the first round, 68 in the second round), whereas the target was only 21 sub-projects. The TF was intended as an incentive mechanism to demonstrate that DPs are worthwhile doing and can be implemented.

TF was the principal RGP O2 mechanism for supporting the implementation of DPs, not only in terms of providing direct funding, but also in terms of providing hands-on capacity building on proposal preparation, procurement and contract management/supervision of contractors, transparent accounting, and progress monitoring.

The contribution from the TF (DFID, UNDP, and PEI resources) for the implementation of DDP priorities/sub-projects was USD 2,150,000, whereas the total amount of funding mobilised for DDP implementation in 13 districts (except Isfara) was USD 375,768,075; hence the TF only provided less than 0.6% of the total funding secured for DDP implementation.

TF modalities: A key feature of the TF were that the funds were managed by the Government and subject to government financial management, procurement and tendering procedures; albeit in accordance with UNDP requirements. A separate account was established at the oblast level for the TF, and each district also opened separate accounts for TF funding. In Tajikistan, this is a quite rare and novel setup. Significant difficulties were faced in setting up the TF while ensuring both government and UNDP regulations were adhered to. This caused significant delays; while the TF was intended to become operational in 2010, the MoU was only signed in late 2011 and the funding was available in March 2012. From March 2012 to June 2013 two rounds of TF sub-projects were prepared and implemented. In the first round, USD 50,000 were allocated for each district, but fund allocations in the second rounds were based on district performance in the implementation of the first round of sub-projects. However, the intention of the Prodoc in terms of performance based allocations was not fully applied: *“A system of performance criteria will be designed which will reward local governments for their plans for economic development; for their delivery on these plans and for the judgment of business civil society on their performance”*.

In the first round, USD 50,000 from PEI were earmarked for environmental projects, in the second round, USD 285,000 were earmarked for VDP priority sub-projects, including USD 110,000 earmarked for mahalla committee proposals for economic empowerment of women.

Sub-projects were selected according to scores obtained against specific economic, social, financial and environmental criteria – but with a higher weight given to the economic criteria.

Co-funding: In relation to the sub-projects implemented with TF funding a prominent feature is the generally high level of co-funding provided by stakeholders:

- Sughd Oblast government provided a cash contribution of USD 220,000.
- Districts governments provided a total cash contribution of USD 137,882. However, the contribution provided by districts varied significantly, Isharavshan district alone contributed with USD 95,096 or 69% of the total district contribution, whereas six districts did not provide any cash contributions.
- Communities and private sector contributed with an estimated USD 1,403,916 in cash or in kind (e.g. hashar labour and construction materials). The community and private sector contributions per district ranged from USD 8,000 to USD 319,000.

Hence the total contribution from government was 9%, the community and private sector contribution was 36%, and the remaining 55% came from the TF.

A detailed overview of TF contributions is provided in Annex 13.

Sub-project intervention types: Most TF sub-projects were related to infrastructure rehabilitation, upgrading or constructions, especially in relation to irrigation (reportedly 85% of all projects were related to irrigation), but also in relation to roads, bridges, and water supply for domestic purposes and homestead gardens.

The first round of TF sub-projects financed 63 small-scale infrastructure sub-projects (60% irrigation sub-projects), which covered 21,334 households, corresponding to 128,039 people, including 59,014 women (46%). This created an estimated 6,646 jobs, including 4,492 jobs for women (67.5%), and generated an estimated overall gross income of USD 8,381,31 in one year. UNDP calculated the return on investment at USD 11.1 per USD invested.

In addition to the infrastructure projects: other sub-projects were related to environment, such as waste collection. Moreover, 12 sub-projects from the second TF round focused on the mahalla level small-scale employment generation/economic empowerment for women, such as eight sewing workshops, two bakeries and one training and production centre, which combined created 114 new jobs for women.

The strong element of infrastructure projects has been an issue of debate, with different perspectives from different stakeholders; the discussion being on whether the TF is sufficiently contributing to the creation of an improved BEE:

- Government is very keen on infrastructure projects for a number of reasons such as: an obligation to fulfil basic social needs of the local population, a high demand in local communities for infrastructure (such as rehabilitation of defunct Soviet infrastructure), promises made to constituencies, infrastructure is tangible and within the professional comfort zone of local governments' technical staff. Hence, there is less of an interest in "soft" BEE projects, which appear less tangible and visible. As one interviewed high-level Government representative explained: *"at the local level you first need to fulfil the basic needs, and only then will people think about business and private sector"*.
- UNDP's position is that businesses cannot thrive without proper basic infrastructure, e.g. to produce the products, which can be processed and sold, or to have good access to markets (e.g. in Khujand or Dushanbe).
- For DFID, the purpose of the TF was to create incentives for further business investments. While DFID understands the need for basic infrastructure and the contribution it makes to economic activities, it is emphasised that there are other, and much larger, funding opportunities available for infrastructure investments, which are expensive. Hence, the modest resources of the TF would in DFID's view be better used to focus on cheaper "soft" BEE projects.

It is clear that while the sub-projects have not had a specific focus on improving the overall BEE in the districts, the infrastructure is usually relevant for enterprises and incomes of the direct sub-project beneficiaries, e.g. with irrigation increasing yields and enabling the production of high-value crops, or with road and bridges improving market access. The Prodoc and the revised logframe refer to TF sub-projects as being economic sub-projects. The Prodoc says that the TF *“will be performance based and will underpin economic development/ business environment performance of targeted districts”* and *“As mentioned above, the Trust Funds will be performance based and will underpin economic development/ business environment performance of targeted districts against benchmarks set up jointly with local stakeholders in the framework of implementation of the economic part of their development plans. RGP will seek to develop a possible incentive mechanism to reward performance around government’s economic development enabling actions”*. But on the other hand, the Prodoc also specifies that *“sub-projects that have an effect on local economic/ agriculture development will be supported”* and *“These incentives will make resources available to local governments which they will be able to prioritize in pursuit of their wider social objectives within their DDPs”*. Hence, the purpose of the TF was to a certain degree open to interpretation.

Quality of sub-projects: Due to the significant delay in getting the TF operational, the time frame available for sub-project implementation was limited, and implementing two rounds of sub-projects was very ambitious, but understandable, as the TF was intended to serve as an incentive mechanism.

However, this also meant that districts were under time pressure to ensure timely implementation, delays in the first round of implementation would affect the funding available for the second round, and the second round projects had to be completed before RGP O2 closure. Given that most sub-projects were infrastructure projects, the time available for their implementation was perhaps too limited, and it is the impression of the evaluation team that the implementation of some projects was rushed at the expense of quality. For example, in one water scheme visited, the taps were broken just one month after completion, the reason reportedly being that only low quality plastic taps were available on the market during the period of implementation.

Another issue that may have affected quality is the limited availability of contractors. In the sub-projects visited by the evaluation team only 2-3 proposals had been received from contractors, and usually contractors from the local area would win, due to lower transport costs. However, local companies may not always have the highest level of technical know-how.

UNDP support: UNDP provided intensive TA and monitoring (with frequent monitoring visits) for the proposal preparation and implementation of sub-projects. This was reportedly necessary in order to minimise risk, not least due to the limited timeframe available for sub-project implementation. It seems that UNDP support was too hands-on.



Ownership: The ownership of the TF mechanism is very high at all levels of government, and there is a strong wish to continue the TF and willingness to gradually increase oblast and district contributions.

One challenge in this regard is that the TF is attracting a lot of attention, which to some extent is at the expense of the overall planning process and capacity building. Some stakeholders appear to see the TF as the core of O2 rather than a relatively small incentive mechanism. Considering that the TF has only financed less than 0.6% of the DPP implementation, there could be an issue of managing expectations.

Appropriateness of TF model: Important results of the TF include a) that it demonstrated the ability of oblast and district government to handle donor funds, and b) that stakeholders found the TF model accountable and transparent.

Nonetheless, an important question for the evaluation was whether the TF was the right modality for RGP (and future interventions), whether the TF should have been structured differently, or whether another modality for support would have been better.

The MTR was very critical about the TF and recommended that the funds were instead provided directly to the beneficiaries/communities – but it should be kept in mind that the TF was not operational at the time of the MTR. UNDP did an analysis of the financial efficiency of the TF model, direct support for communities and of tendering support; UNDP found the TF model the most cost-effective. For the evaluation team, the cost-effectiveness is not the key issue in this context, it is rather that direct support or tendering would only assure support for the direct beneficiaries, while the TF modality had a transformational potential in terms of building local government capacity to prepare proposals, implement sub-projects, and handle donor funds; while demonstrating the value of good development planning. Hence, the evaluation team finds that direct support for communities (and tendering by UNDP) would have been irrelevant for RGP O2.

Another option that could provide similar benefits could have been direct financial support for districts, so they could spend the money according to their own priorities. This model could possibly work in the future, although not all districts have the same level of capacity, and the currently proactive role of the oblast in terms of screening proposals, providing technical support and providing co-funding would probably be less.

Moreover, the significant effort and time-consuming process put in to establishing the TF, the high local ownership of the TF and the fact that the TF model has proven to be functional, should be considered before deciding to use a different mechanism. The experiences of the State Committee on Investment and State Property Management in establishing the ADB-funded Business Support Fund shows that the TF was actually made operational fairly quickly, the Government borrowed ADB funds in 2009, but it is only in 2013 that the Business Support Fund became operational. Hence a new

modality would probably take time to become operational and could have a negative impact on the commitment from some stakeholders, notably the oblast.

Nonetheless, even if it is decided to continue the TF, there is scope for tweaking its modalities. For the TF to remain attractive to DFID, it is critical that it specifically focuses on a) ensuring a stronger BEE and b) enhancing the public-private dialogue.

In relation to a possible continuation of the TF, the following should be taken into account: a) the costs of infrastructure, b) the modest contribution of the TF to DDP implementation compared to the total funds raised, c) potential sustainability issues related to infrastructure (see Chapter 4.8 Sustainability), and d) the current areas of weaknesses in the DDPs on crosscutting issues (see Chapter 4.2.4 Crosscutting issues) and “soft” management and capacity issues. A lesson from the TF presented in the 2012 RGP Annual Progress Reports is that there should be more focus on “soft” sub-projects addressing BEE. Hence, is the opinion of the evaluation team that a possible continuation of the TF should to a much larger extent finance “soft” sub-projects, i.e. sub-projects addressing crosscutting issues, and projects specifically targeting BEE. However, this would require strategic support to districts and jamoats on how to analyse and prioritise these aspects, and how to prepare sub-projects that address this. Any investments in infrastructure sub-projects should be based on a clear justification and analysis of their economic/BEE impact.

Another area that would need adjustments is the way that social and environmental sustainability is addressed. It is good that social and environmental criteria are included, but with the heavier weighting given to economic criteria, sub-projects selected due to their economic benefits may be detrimental to the environment. Hence, in addition to the current environmental criteria, environmental screenings/impact assessments should be mandatory and whenever there is a risk of a negative environmental (or social) impact, an environmental mitigation plan should be elaborated and implemented – and if this is not possible, the sub-project should be rejected.

### **Conclusions:**

- The TF target was significantly surpassed; 131 sub-projects were implemented; the target was 21.
- TF was the principal RGP O2 mechanism for supporting the implementation of DPs.
- The TF provided USD 2,150,000 for DP implementation; less than 0.6% of the total funding mobilised for DDP implementation.
- TF funds were managed by Government under its procedures.
- Difficulties in setting up the TF while ensuring both government and UNDP regulations were adhered to caused significant delays; the MoU was signed in late 2011 and the funding was available in March 2012.
- From March 2012 to June 2013 two rounds of sub-projects TF funding were prepared and implemented.
- Fund allocations for the second rounds were performance based.

- Sub-projects were selected according to scores obtained against specific economic, social, financial and environmental criteria – but with a higher weight given to the economic criteria.
- Overall, the stakeholder contribution (especially from communities and in some cases private sector, in cash and in kind) for TF sub-projects was high, albeit with significant variations at the district level. The total contribution from government was 9%, the community and private sector contribution was 36%, and the remaining 55% came from the TF.
- Most TF sub-projects were infrastructure sub-projects; 85% of all sub-projects were on irrigation.
- Some sub-projects were related to environment, such as waste collection.
- 12 sub-projects focused on the mahalla level created 114 new jobs for women.
- The strong element of infrastructure projects has been an issue of debate, keen on infrastructure projects, whereas DFID's main interest is to focus on "soft" projects aimed at enhancing the BEE. The government and UNDP argue that infrastructure is a prerequisite for business, whereas DFID argues that infrastructure is expensive and other and larger funding sources are available for this.
- The short time frame available for TF implementation affected in some cases sub-project quality.
- Due to the limited time available, UNDP was very, and probably overly, hands-on in supporting TF sub-project planning and implementation.
- The ownership of the TF mechanism is very high at all levels of government, and there is a strong wish to continue the TF and willingness to gradually increase oblast and district contributions.
- The TF is attracting a lot of attention (compared to its modest size), to some extent at the expense of the overall planning process and capacity building. There could be an issue of managing expectations.
- The TF was an appropriate mechanism for supporting DP implementation.
- The TF demonstrated the ability of oblast and district government to handle donor funds.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Continue TF but with increasing government contribution from oblast and rayons (in per cent and actual figures) for each round.
- Conduct an independent and in-depth audit of TF incl. sub-projects, so government can prove its capacity to handle donor funds.
- Identify alternative funding sources for TF (short and long term) as a key priority, to facilitate a more long-term perspective (e.g. five years).
- Have a maximum of one TF round per year.
- Ensure that a future TF much larger extent finances "soft" sub-projects, sub-projects addressing crosscutting issues, and projects specifically targeting BEE (e.g. through earmarking of funds).

- Provide strategic support to districts and jamoats on how to analyse and prioritise the BEE and crosscutting issues, and how to prepare sub-projects that address these.
- Demand clear business justification and analysis of the economic/BEE impact in any investments in infrastructure sub-projects.
- Include in TF modalities: a) mandatory environmental screenings/impact assessments, and b) preparation and implementation environmental mitigation plans – if mitigation is impossible, the sub-project should be rejected.
- Analyse the reasons behind the significant differences in local contribution levels to gain an understanding of the underlying dynamics.
- Disaggregate contributions from communities (incl. smallholder farmers) and private sector (companies).
- Broaden the support for DP implementation to go beyond TF, and providing capacity building, TA and mentoring in relation to projects for which districts and jamoats have secured funding elsewhere. This should be done with a particular emphasis on “soft”, BEE and crosscutting issues.
- Map available funding windows (government), which rayons and jamoats can approach for different sector priorities/intervention types.
- Map the priorities (thematic, geographical, target recipients) of donors (bilateral, multilateral, NGOs), and make available for rayons.
- Provide guidance to WGs on what soft BEE sub-projects and projects addressing crosscutting issues could entail, including providing tangible examples of soft BEE sub-projects.

### **Lessons:**

- Local government, especially oblast authorities, have the capacity to manage donor funding.
- TF is a powerful incentive mechanism for preparation and implementation of local development plans, which can build strong local ownership of a decentralised and participatory/inclusive development planning process. However, this high level of attention can distract attention from the process it is intended as an incentive to support.
- Significant contributions in cash and in kind can be raised for TF sub-project implementation, but the contributions vary significantly among districts (probably depending on a combination of different local capacities and the type of the sub-projects).
- Sufficient time should be allowed for sub-project implementation to ensure that quality is not compromised.
- Local stakeholders tend to gravitate towards “hard” infrastructure projects as these are tangible, visible and within the “comfort” zone of stakeholders. This is further exacerbated in Tajikistan by the Soviet history, where there was high rural infrastructure coverage.
- Strong efforts are needed to promote “soft” sub-projects on BEE and crosscutting issues, otherwise local stakeholders will focus on infrastructure. This includes strategic support to enhance local

government capacity to analyse and prioritise the BEE and crosscutting issues, and how to prepare sub-projects that address these.

#### **4.2.3 Support to institutional capacity to create a business enabling environment**

The target associated with the BBE component of *implementing four initiatives at the local level to enhance business environment* was met. While the work under this sub-component was at a lower scale than the other two components a number of initiatives were carried out at both oblast and district levels. Some key elements under this sub-component are described in this section. UNDP under this sub-component focused on increasing local authorities' understanding of BEE issues and making them ready for the dialogue with, and improve their service delivery to, the private sector.

E-governance: E-governance has now been adopted by state regulation. O2 aimed at supporting this by creating interactive websites where the private sector and wider public can a) access information and monitor government, and b) communicate with local governments, e.g. in relation to obtaining permits and info, and submitting complaints. E-governance work under O2 was initiated in 2012 and the process was not fully completed under O2, districts have not yet fully uploaded the necessary information to the websites. Sughd Oblast government was assisted with updating their website interphase and the oblast website now provides public access to oblast level plans.

Furthermore, the establishment of websites for all 14 districts was supported. These websites provided information on the districts, DPs, business opportunities, legal reforms, investment and export promotion, and on obtaining permits from the local administration (ongoing work), and b) contain an online feedback mechanism for communication with district governments. Computer and website maintenance training was provided for district government staff. Spitamen's website had 2866 visits in six months.

Public-private dialogue (PPD): Inspired by the results and good dialogue achieved at the national level PPD platform (the Consultative Council) under Output 4 with the establishment of the oblast level DDP platform, UNDP decided to pilot similar forums in three districts (Isfara, Istavshan, Panjakent). These PPD platforms are conducted as regular meetings with participation of the district chairperson and deputy chairpersons, representatives of various government departments, and representatives of the private sector. The district PPD's became operational in 2013, and each have had two PPD meeting were issues such as the new tax law and its implications have been discussed, with the intention of bringing local concerns to the attention of the national level. However, the PPD process at district level is still new, so the actual results, and whether the PPD results at oblast level can be emulated at district level, remain to be seen. PPDs could potentially be a tool to enhance private sector involvement in DDP planning.

Furthermore, oblast level consultations were carried out with entrepreneurs on the draft laws "On Support and Development of entrepreneurship" and "Amendments to the Law On Inspections"; recommendations from these were

provided to the State Committee on Investments and State Property Management. The extent to which the recommendations were taken on board is not known to the evaluation team.

Local Economic Performance Indicator (LEPI): LEPI is a composite indicator taking a range of information on the local economy and business environment into account. It is intended as a mechanism to provide information on business development as well as private sector perception. LEPI combines official statistic data and information gathered with the use of modern communication technology as an alternative to expensive surveys. It was piloted by O2 in Bobojon Gafurov district.

Local Economic Development (LED): LED was part of the training package provided to district government staff for the DDP process. The purpose of the LED approach, which was developed by the World Bank, is to refocus government from the role as social services provider towards being an enabler of economic development. LED included training on analysis of the local economy, preparation of investment projects, public and private dialogue, public private partnerships, investments promotion, and export and trade promotion.

Sughd investment profile: An investment profile for Sughd (English and Russian) was prepared and disseminated to provide information on opportunities to potential investors.

### **Conclusions:**

- The target associated with the BBE component of *implementing four initiatives at the local level to enhance business environment* was met.
- 14 district websites with some interactive e-governance elements were developed, and the oblast website was updated.
- PPD platforms were piloted in three districts.
- PPDs could potentially become a tool to enhance private sector involvement in DDP planning.
- LEPI was piloted in one district.
- LED training was included in training package for development planning.
- It is still early days for e-governance, district PPD and LEPI, and the results have not materialised yet.

### **Recommendations:**

- Monitor district capacity to maintain and update websites.
- Monitor response times to queries and complaints submitted through websites.
- Link PPD to DDP process as a means to enhance private sector participation in the planning.

### **Lessons:**

- Lessons are expected to emerge as the key BEE initiatives (e-governance, PPD, LEPI) mature and results emerge.

#### 4.2.4 Crosscutting issues

Considerable efforts were put into addressing crosscutting issues, such as environment, gender, and migration. Partnerships were made with agencies/programmes specialised in these issues (PEI, UN Women, and IOM).

Environment: PEI's approach to poverty and environment was mainstreamed into MEDT's planning methodology. Results include that district ecological departments are now represented in DDP WGs, a separate chapter on environment was included in the DDP format, and PEI also facilitated the inclusion of environmental indicators in the national development indicators. Furthermore, PEI provided capacity building to oblast and district WGs on environmental issues, e.g. in relation to environmental screening.

All 14 DDPs include sections on the environment, as well as background information on the environment in the districts, but the environmental analysis often appears to lack coverage of some aspects, such as land degradation and upper catchment protection. Some DDPs also have environmental priorities includes (such as waste management). However, the environmental priorities in DDP do not always address the environmental issues identified, and sometimes priorities included under the environment section are not truly environmental.

For the first TF round, PEI provided USD 50,000 in co-funding for six sub-projects specifically related to poverty-environment issues. In the second round, environment was included in the criteria for sub-project selection, hence proposals had to be screened by the district ecology departments, who could request modifications to the proposal and ensure the needed permits and licenses were obtained. Some of the projects supported in the second round were environmental (e.g. waste collection). However, as described earlier, economic criteria were given more weight than the environmental criteria.

Disaster management/reduction: Tajikistan is prone to a disasters related to a range of hazard types (e.g. earthquakes, land slides, drought, flash floods, avalanches), especially in the mountainous areas. In DPPs, disasters are covered under environment. All DDPs mention disasters, but the extent to which an analysis is done and priority projects have been identified to prevent disasters or reduce the risk varies significantly; and this variation appears not just be related to the different geographic contexts.

Climate change: Climate change was not included in the RGP design, and was not specifically addressed in the implementation of O2. Nonetheless, climate change is mentioned in a few DDPs. Considering the dependency on glaciers and snow melt as water sources in much of Tajikistan and the arid climate, rural Tajik communities are likely to be vulnerable to climate change impact. Furthermore, the capacity of irrigation infrastructure may also be compromised in the future if the glaciers and snow that feed them are reduced.

Gender: UN Women piloted gender mainstreaming in two districts (Gonchi and Isfara). Furthermore, UN Women assisted with mainstreaming gender into the MEDT planning methodology, which was used by the districts for DDP preparation. However, only two of the 14 DDPs actually include gender as a strategic priority. The other DDPs mostly mention women in relation to health, but not in relation to other spheres of life such as jobs, income and education. As described above, 12 TF projects specifically targeted women's economic empowerment at a small scale and generated employment for women. One of the two social criteria for selection of TF sub-projects was gender related. UNDP estimates that 67% of the jobs created by the first round of TF sub-projects were for women.

The logframe indicators were not gender disaggregated. However, other gender-disaggregated indicators were monitored (e.g. in relation to number of beneficiaries reached, people trained, jobs created, representation in WGs).

Migration: With a budget allocation of almost USD 500,000 for IOM, migration related activities played a quite prominent role in O2. 13 of the 14 districts in Sughd were covered. The main areas of work include:

Development planning. Training for oblast and district government staff on migration management and mainstreaming of migration into development planning, 16 trainings were done, reaching 398 officials. Guidance on the integration of migration issues was incorporated in the MEDT planning methodology. Special support was provided to five districts with high rates of labour migration for addressing migration issues in their DDPs. Migration is included/mentioned in the context analysis of all DDPs to differing degrees (e.g. in terms of the social challenges posed by migration and the opportunities provided by remittances), but only some of them include specific actions/priorities related to migration. In RGP's report "*Mainstreaming Migration in Local Economic Development - Key Issues and Lessons Learned*" it is stated that "*despite the fact that migration has been included in several district development planning processes in the Sughd Province, it still does not feature comprehensively and concretely in local development plans.*" The reasons found for this included a lack of migration data and indicators, financial and human resource capacity constraints, absence of a coherent national migration strategy, and the complexity and crosscutting nature of migration. Nonetheless, the report also finds that "*the migration issues that are actually reflected in the five [supported] District Development Plans include those that can be resolved with existing public budgetary resources and are relatively easier to implement*".

Training, counselling and information for communities and migrants. Local NGO partners of IOM conducted 285 trainings for mahalla committees, communities and migrants; a total of 7,091 people (incl. 3,469 women) were trained. Training was provided on family budget management and effective use of remittances for community development (mahalla committee representatives participated to facilitate the mobilisation of voluntary contributions from migrants for community projects). Reportedly, 40-50% of the contributions to village development funds (VDFs) were from migrant



remittances, and a number of projects at mahalla and jamoat levels were implemented with contributions from remittances. Moreover, migrants were provided with free legal counselling; one day where people could get a free consultation with a lawyer was arranged in each of the jamoats covered. In total 17,603 persons received counselling (incl. 5,629 women). Information materials were prepared (pre-departure orientation handbook and video, leaflet on legal migration, referral cards on information sources, book on Russian language for migrants) and over 30,000 copies in total were disseminated.

### **Conclusions:**

- Environment, gender and migration were mainstreamed into MEDT's planning methodology and the DDP preparation process; in the case of environment, it has a separate chapter in the DDPs.
- District ecological departments are now included in DDP WGs.
- Capacity building and training was provided to oblast and district government staff and DDP WGs on poverty-environment, gender, and migration.
- The environmental analysis in DDPs often appears to lack coverage of some aspects, and the environmental priorities in DDP do not always address the environmental issues identified.
- Two districts were supported in integration of gender in their DDPs.
- Gender is only covered strategically in two DDPs. In the other DDPs, gender is mentioned, but mostly in relation to health only.
- The TF sub-projects were screened by district ecology departments.
- The TF sub-project selection process included environmental and gender criteria, but economic criteria were given more weight.
- All DDPs mention disasters, but the extent to which an analysis is done and priority projects have been identified varies significantly.
- Some TF sub-projects specifically addressed environment or gender empowerment.
- UNDP estimates that 67% of the jobs created by the first round of TF sub-projects were for women.
- Five districts were supported in integration of migration in their DDPs.
- Migration is included/mentioned in the context analysis of all DDPs to differing degrees, but only some of them include specific actions/priorities related to migration.
- 7091 people were trained on migration and financial management.
- Reportedly, 40-50% of the contributions to village development funds (VDFs) were from migrant remittances, and a number of projects were implemented with contributions from remittances.
- 17,603 persons received legal counselling on migration.
- Over 30,000 copies of migration information materials were disseminated.

### **Recommendations:**

- Further strengthen the capacity to coherently address environment, disaster risk reduction, gender and migration in DDPs, including formulating priority actions that address the issues identified.

- Include climate change resilience and adaptation as a cross-cutting issue in MEDT's planning methodology and in future initiatives supporting DP processes. Climate change impacts should also be considered in relation to infrastructure projects.
- Include in TF modalities: a) mandatory environmental screenings/impact assessments, and b) preparation and implementation of environmental mitigation plans – if mitigation is impossible, the sub-project should be rejected.

### **Lessons learned:**

- It takes continued efforts over to ensure that an enhanced understanding of crosscutting issues is also translated into coherent responses to these in the DPs. Otherwise, there is a likelihood of them being merely being mentioned without being analysed and tackled in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

### **4.3 External factors – risks and assumptions**

Risks in the logframe: Some of the risks identified in the logframe have proven valid, such as competence constraints at district and jamoat level (although this does not appear to have hampered capacity building efforts), limited budgets at district level and lack of budgets at the jamoat level, and inability of other donors to provide funding for the TF. Others have not been relevant, e.g. those related to jamoat resource centres (JRCs), as these have not played a major role in O2 implementation. Some risks have not materialised such as continued limited mandates of local governments vis-à-vis economic development. Annex 8 provides a detailed assessment of the risks identified in the logframe.

Assumptions in the logframe: Most of the assumptions in the logframe have proven valid, so absence of these did not caused disruptions to O2 implementation. However, the assumption that local governments would be given more authority in revenue collection and use of revenues was not correct, and this has limited their ability to allocate funds for DP implementation. Annex 9 provides a detailed assessment of the assumptions identified in the logframe.

External factors: A number of external factors, which have influenced, or potentially could influence, the implementation and results of O2 have been identified. Some of these have already been described in previous chapters, and some are reflected in the risks and assumptions in the logframe:

- The Government budgeting and planning processes are not well linked, and budgeting remains centralised. Most of the taxes collected by local governments are transferred to central government, which then allocates funds for local governments (taking budgets prepared by local governments into account); the funding mostly is earmarked for specific purposes, and mainly covering salaries and running costs. Hence, the funding that districts can allocate for investments is limited. Ongoing reforms are anticipated to address this issue in the future. Although the 2009 Law on Village Self-governance Bodies has enhanced the mandate of jamoats and specifies they should have their own

budgetary resources, they do not yet have their own budgets other than for salaries and running costs.

- While the Government during the last decade or so has been undergoing a decentralisation process, the legacy of centralised and top-down decision-making is still affecting the way that Government works, sometimes even in areas that have been decentralised. This is reportedly generally affecting project implementation in Tajikistan.
- The de-facto centralised establishment of tariffs, e.g. for irrigation water, domestic water and waste collection pose a challenge for the ensuring full O&M cost recovery, and can hence threaten the sustainability of infrastructure sub-projects and service delivery. (See Chapter 4.8 Sustainability).
- Staff turnover in local government at both the technical and managerial/political level can affect the future preparation of development plans, as staff, which have undergone trainings may leave for other position. While the MEDT planning methodology has been included in the Institute for Civil Servants Training's curriculum to ensure sustainability, it is unlikely that this will ensure the same level of training and support as provided under RGP O2. (See Chapter 4.8 Sustainability).
- Labour migration from Tajikistan is very high, and in 2011 remittances accounted for 45% of the GDP. This significantly affects the social dynamics, and pose a serious challenge. The oblast and some district authorities see it as a priority to create domestic jobs, which can be alternatives to migration. However, it can be difficult for local jobs, especially in the agricultural sector, to compete with the salaries migrant labourers can earn (e.g. in Russia). It will also be difficult for export sectors to match the contribution of foreign revenue that remittances inject to Tajikistan's economy.
- Corruption is a major problem in Tajikistan. While significant efforts have been made to ensure strong mechanisms and transparency in the use of RGP O2 funding, it can be difficult to make any system fully protected from misuse of funds. Corruption or elite capture can take place at all levels, all the way down to the community level. This is a risk for any programme in Tajikistan.
- With the upcoming elections, there could be a certain risk that the TF could be used for political purposes; although this does not imply that sub-projects are selected politically as the established TF modalities would probably offer good protection against this.

### **Conclusions:**

- Some of the risks identified in the logframe have proven valid, but they have not significantly hampered O2 implementation.
- Most of the assumptions in the logframe have proven valid.
- The assumption that local governments would be given more authority in revenue collection and use of revenues was not valid, and this has limited their ability to allocate funds for DP implementation.
- A number of external factors, have influenced, or could potentially influence, the implementation and results of O2:

- Government budgeting and planning processes are not well linked, and budgeting remains centralised, so the funding that districts can allocate for investments is limited. Jamoats do not yet have their own budgetary resources.
- The legacy of centralised and top-down decision-making is still affecting the way that Government works.
- The de-facto centralised establishment of tariffs poses a challenge for the ensuring full O&M cost recovery, and can potentially threaten the sustainability of infrastructure sub-projects.
- Staff turnover in local government at both the technical and managerial/political level can affect the future preparation of DPs. It is unlikely that the Institute for Civil Servants Training's curriculum to ensure sustainability can ensure the same level of training and support as under O2.
- Corruption is a major problem in Tajikistan. Significant efforts have been made to ensure strong mechanism and transparency in the use of RGP O2 funding, but it can be difficult to ensure full protection from misuse of funds.
- With the upcoming elections, there is a risk that the TF is used for political purposes; although the established TF modalities would offer good protection against political selection of sub-projects.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Lobby for decentralisation of the Government budgeting process and linking it to the planning process.
- Lobby for jamoats getting small budgets for investments.
- Lobby for decentralisation of price setting (water, waste management) to be based on actual costs of investment and O&M.

#### **4.4 Relevance**

O2 helped Government with implementing at the local level new policies, guidelines and legislation related to ongoing decentralisation. It focused on building local government capacity to assume the roles and responsibilities outlined in legislation related to the ongoing decentralisation in Tajikistan, and supported the updating and roll-out of MEDT's planning methodology. Through a bottom-up and participatory planning process, it enhanced the capacity of local governments to lead the development and implementation of development plans in a more inclusive manner, taking local priorities and needs into account. Several stakeholders expressed an appreciation of enhanced inclusion and transparency resulting from the planning methodology promoted. Furthermore, having DPs reportedly enhanced their ability to mobilise funds for investments in development.

The TF was an incentive mechanism, which helped ensuring a small part of development plans was implemented demonstrated the value of good planning. The implementation of sub-projects was also a means to strengthen the implementation capacity of district governments.

Government stakeholders show a strong interest in, and feel a very strong ownership, of the DP planning process and in particular the TF. The evaluation team also saw a strong community ownership of sub-projects and seemingly also of VDPs, but private sector ownership appears more mixed.

The fact the districts could access TF funds to implement sub-project of their own priority was instrumental in this. However, the flip-side was that sub-projects tended to focus on fairly traditional infrastructure rehabilitation rather than strategically helping districts to implement sub-projects addressing more difficult yet equally important “soft” priorities, e.g. on BEE and crosscutting issues (with PEI sub-projects as a possible exception from this).

O2 was well aligned with UNDP’s mandate of poverty eradication by focusing on income generation, as well as UNDP’s focus on democratic governance. It supported the implementation at the local level of NDS and PRS, in was thus linked to achieving the MDGs.

While O2 was not directly linked to the activities of other donors at the local level, it was linked to donor support for government reforms, such as the agrarian reform and public administration reform, improving government capacity and improving the business/investment environment. Moreover, it provided lessons to the central level on local implementation of development plans. Hence, it fed into NDS/PRS dialogue, in which other donors participate. O2 also enhanced the capacity of a number of districts to engage with other donors.

However, the logical connection between O2 and the other outputs appears not very strong, and having them in a single programme has been a challenge for UNDP and GIZ. Another challenge for O2 has been to balance the business/private sector oriented focus of RGP with local governments’ broader mandate to ensure both economic development and access to social services, and the strong interest in infrastructure in both government and local communities in infrastructure rehabilitation, as evidenced in the focus of most TF sub-projects. It should however, be kept in mind that infrastructure is one of the prerequisites for private sector and economic development, not least for the agricultural sector, which remains a key sector in the Tajik economy.

### **Conclusions:**

- The focus and approach of O2 was very relevant in relation to the roll-out of new policies and MEDT’s methodology on decentralisation and more inclusive and transparent development planning based on local priorities.
- The TF demonstrated the value of good planning and was also a means to strengthen the implementation capacity of district governments.
- Government stakeholders show a strong interest in, and feel a very strong ownership, of the DP planning process and in particular the TF.
- Communities show a strong ownership of TF sub-projects and seemingly also of VDPs.
- Private sector ownership appears somewhat mixed.

- That districts could access TF funds to implement sub-project of their own priority was instrumental for the creation of ownership.
- TH sub-projects tended to focus on fairly traditional infrastructure rehabilitation rather than strategically enabling districts to implement sub-projects addressing “soft” priorities, e.g. on BEE and crosscutting issues.
- O2 was aligned with UNDP’s focus on poverty eradication and democratic governance.
- O2 supported the implementation at the local level of NDS and PRS.
- A challenge for O2 has been to balance the business/private sector oriented focus of RGP with local governments’ broader mandate to ensure both economic development and access to social services, and the strong interest in infrastructure.

#### 4.5 Efficiency

Overall, the use of resources (human and financial) of O2 appears quite good. The implementation of O2 appears mostly as timely and without significant delays, at least in relation to the elaboration and support for DPs. However, the TF implementation was delayed significantly due to challenges in reconciling Government and UNDP procedures and rules, which were not fully taken into consideration in the programme design, which were thus overly optimistic in relation to the time needed to establish the TF. But once the TF was operational, two rounds of sub-projects were implemented in a short time frame. The use of Government’s financial management and procurement procedures for the TF appears not to have caused any significant delays. However, the delays with the TF, and hence the limited time frame available for sub-project implementation, appears to have affected the cost-effectiveness of spending in relation to some sub-projects, e.g. in one water supply sub-project purchased poor quality plastic taps, which were already needing replacement after one month.

The piloting of district level PPDs was not envisaged in the Prodoc and was initiated in late 2012; had these been initiated earlier they could have been upscaled to more districts, and possibly contributed to the DDP formulation process.

The use of UNDP’s Communities Programme (CP) as a mechanism for delivery of O2 appears to be an important reason for the timely implementation, as it enabled the programme to benefit from already established UNDP Area Offices (AOs) and experiences from other projects under CP. It also gave UNDP the capacity to closely supervise and support the DP process and TF sub-project planning and implementation. This enabled frequent contact with local stakeholders, and a strong capacity to monitor and follow-up on implementation. However, while UNDP support was generally appropriate, UNDP was been quite hands-on and allocated significant staff-time resources, e.g. to the planning and monitoring of TF sub-projects – perhaps some of this time would have been better spent on building local government capacity to carry out good monitoring in general.

The average costs for capacity building, DP preparation (DDPs, JDPs, and VDPs) etc. was below USD 175,000 per district (based on the total O2 budget, excluding TF resources). With the significant funds mobilised for DDP implementation, UNDP has estimated the economic return on funds invested in DDPs at USD 99 per USD invested. Similarly, the significant co-funding was secured for TF sub-projects, and based on calculations of the incomes generated in one year by the first round of TF sub-projects, UNDP has calculated the rate of return on the sub-project investments at 11.1 USD per USD invested.

### Conclusions:

- Overall, the use of resources (human and financial) of O2 appears quite good.
- The implementation of O2 appears mostly as being timely and without significant delays in relation to the elaboration and support for DPs.
- TF implementation was initially delayed significantly due to challenges in reconciling government and UNDP procedures and rules.
- Two rounds of TF sub-projects were implemented in a short time frame.
- The use of Government's procedures for the TF has not caused significant delays.
- The delays with the TF have affected the cost-effectiveness in spending in relation to some sub-projects.
- Earlier initiation of district PPDs could have enabled them to be upscaled and contribute to the DDP formulation process.
- The use of CP as a mechanism for delivery of O2 appears to be an important reason for the timely implementation, and enabled the programme to benefit from already established UNDP AOs.
- While UNDP support was generally appropriate, UNDP was been quite hands-on and allocated significant staff-time resources.
- The average costs for capacity building, DP preparation (DDPs, JDPs, and VDPs) etc. was below USD 175,000 per district.
- With the significant funds mobilised for DDP implementation, UNDP has estimated the economic return on funds invested in DDPs at USD 99 per USD invested.
- TF sub-projects, UNDP has calculated the rate of return on the sub-project investments at 11.1 USD per USD invested in the first round of TF sub-projects.

### 4.6 Effectiveness

As described in the Chapter 4.2 (Progress and results), all targets for the three O2 indicators in the revised logframe were met, and in relation to the second indicator on TF sub-projects, the target was significantly exceeded.

The Output: *“Improved capacities of local governance actors (particularly at rayon and jamoat levels) for local development planning emphasising rural economic growth, for plans implementation and monitoring in line with NDS and PRS”* was delivered, although some areas still need further

strengthening, as described in Chapter 4.2 (Progress and results) and 4.1.2 (Monitoring).

To achieve O2, a large number and broad range of activities were implemented; and the quality of the activities generally appears good.

The approach to development planning promoted has enhanced transparency and inclusion of the views and priorities of local stakeholders, through its consultative processes and inclusion of both government and other actors in the WGs at oblast, district, and jamoat levels. Similarly, the mahalla level activities have strengthened the community capacity to manage own resources and provide inputs to the planning process. This has been a significant change of paradigm from the traditional centralised planning in Tajikistan and from the district level planning, which only involved government staff and did not include any consultations.

The DDPs have proven a useful tool for mobilising both local and external resources for the implementation of development priorities. However, their effectiveness and the ability to implement them will also depend on a better integration between planning and budgeting processes in the future (which ongoing budget reforms are anticipated to provide). Nonetheless many DPs display a good degree of implementation, measured as percentage of the budget actually mobilised and a fairly good degree of implementation measured as number of priority projects implemented (see Annex 14). However, there are still shortcomings in the conceptual understanding of “soft” issues, as well as BEE and crosscutting issues, and ability to address these strategically and coherently remains limited. The DP model promoted has also proven effective in mobilising local stakeholders, especially communities, although private sector involvement in DP processes could be further enhanced. Furthermore, the district M&E capacity appears still not sufficient to ensure that sub-projects are environmentally sustainable, and to fully ensure the equality of investments.

The TF was an effective tool for mobilising government and community resources, not least when compared to its relatively modest size. It also provided government with a unique opportunity to demonstrate its ability to be a partner for donors and to manage funds transparently. Moreover, the TF was also an important incentive mechanism to demonstrate the value of good planning and for creating local ownership. The TF was the principal mechanism of O2 for building the capacity of district governments to implement their DDPs, by providing support to proposal development, procurement and supervision of implementation – the TF appears to have been an effective mechanism for this.

The implementation of the BEE sub-component is still in its early days so its effectiveness is yet to be fully seen. The new district PPD platforms are still to prove their effectiveness and ability to achieve tangible changes. Nonetheless, the district PPDs have already mobilised representatives for the private sector to engage in discussions on key topics, such as the new tax law. PPDs could potentially become a tool for enhancing private sector



involvement in the DDP process. The introduction of new websites with e-governance elements has improved the access to information and could facilitate the dialogue with local authorities.

Overall, O2 was fairly effective in *in promoting a more fertile relationship between public and private sectors and to contributing to local development*, although private sector mobilisation was generally not quite as strong as community mobilisation. Private sector has participated in DP WGs and provided financial contributions for TF sub-projects. The presence and nature of private sector, and hence the potential, differs significantly among districts.

### **Conclusions:**

- The output was delivered, although some areas still need further strengthening.
- The quality of the activities implemented generally appears good.
- The DP approach of O2 has enhanced transparency and inclusion of local stakeholders from the mahalla to the oblast level.
- The DDPs have proven a useful tool for mobilising both local and external resources for the implementation of development priorities, but their effectiveness and the ability to implemented also depends on a better integration between planning and budgeting processes in the future
- Many DPs display a good degree of implementation.
- There are still shortcomings in the conceptual understanding of “soft “ issues, as well as BEE and crosscutting issues, and the ability to address these strategically and coherently remains limited.
- The DP model promoted has proven effective in mobilising local stakeholders, especially communities, although private sector involvement in DP processes could be further enhanced.
- District M&E capacity is still not sufficient to ensure that sub-projects are environmentally sustainable, and to fully ensure quality of investments.
- The TF has been an effective tool to mobilise government and community resources.
- The TF provided government with a unique opportunity to demonstrate its ability to be a partner for donors and to manage funds transparently.
- The TF was also an important incentive mechanism to demonstrate the value of good planning and for creating local ownership.
- Moreover, the TF appears to have been an effective mechanism for building the capacity of district governments to implement their DDPs.
- The implementation of the BEE sub-component is still in its early days so its effectiveness is yet to be fully seen.
- PPD could potentially become a tool for enhancing private sector involvement in the DDP process.
- O2 was fairly effective in *in promoting a more fertile relationship between public and private sectors and to contributing to local development*, although private sector mobilisation was generally not quite as strong as community mobilisation.

## 4.7 Impact

Annex 15 shows the changes in terms of number of jobs created, produced goods in industry, and produced goods in agriculture – disaggregated per district. A moderately increasing trend in the creation of new jobs has been experienced, as well as high growth rates in the industrial and agricultural production. However, the extent to which the DDPs have contributed to this change is not possible to assess as this is also determined by several other factors, such as global, regional, and national economic trends. Furthermore, possible impacts of the new DP process are unlikely to fully materialise in the short term. In fact, the growth was higher in 2010-2011, before the DDPs had fully moved into implementation, than in 2011-2012.

TF funded sub-projects led to tangible changes for direct beneficiaries (as also indicator in Chapter 4.2.2 Trust Fund). Impact figures were only available to the evaluation team for the first round of TF sub-projects, which had the following estimated impact results:

- Number of people reached: 21,334 households/128,039 people, including 59,014 women (46%)
  - these were mainly provided with increased access to irrigation water, reportedly resulting in enhanced agricultural production, diversified crop production with more focus on high-value crops, increased incomes from sales of agricultural products
- Number of jobs created: 6,646 jobs, including 4,492 jobs for women (67.5%)
- Overall gross income generated in one year: USD 8,381,319, corresponding to USD 65 per person/year or USD 393 per household/year
- Other infrastructure, such as bridges and roads, have improved the access to markets and reduced transport costs.
- In addition to these economic impacts; some projects have generated social and environmental impacts, such as access to safe drinking water and waste collection.

It is still too early to see impacts from the activities under the BEE sub-component. However, it is hoped that the PPD will further enhance the role of the private sector in priority setting for development plans and enable the private sector to better voice their concerns to the Government. The main impact of the TF in terms of contributing to an improved BEE has been to enhance agricultural production and incomes for direct beneficiaries. It is currently not possible to attribute changes in the BEE to the DDPs.

As described in Chapter 4.1.2 Monitoring, it is impossible to verify the extent to which O2 has contributed to changes in the Goal/Impact defined in the RGP logframe to contributions of O2. The Business Perception Survey could potentially provide some indication of the contribution of O2 to the intended Purpose/Outcome of RGP, but the 2012 Survey is not available in English, and it would probably be too early to see significant perception changes among private sector actors. Nonetheless, the evaluation team believes that O2 has:

- Begun to contribute to the RGP Goal of creating an improved

- environment in Sughd for income generation and employment
- Begun to contribute to the RGP Purpose of ensuring more inclusive economic development in rural Tajikistan

### **Conclusions:**

- The extent to which the DDPs have contributed to changes in terms of jobs created and enhanced production is not possible to assess, and the possible impacts of the new DP process are unlikely to fully materialise in the short term.
- TF funded sub-projects led to tangible changes for direct beneficiaries in terms of increased incomes and access to jobs.
- It is still too early to see impacts from the activities under the BEE sub-component.
- The TF has contributed to an improved BEE has been to enhance agricultural production and income for the direct beneficiaries.
- It is currently not possible to attribute changes in the BEE to the DDPs.
- It is not possible to measure the contribution of O2 to achieving the Goal and Purpose for RGP, but the evaluation team believes O2 as begun to contribute to this.

### **4.8 Sustainability**

It is assumed that the districts now have the capacity to plan and implement DDPs using the RGP methodology. While this is probably true in a number of districts, it is probably not the case in all districts (e.g. due to staff turnover, uneven understanding of the process among WG members, changing priorities of new district chairs). It should be kept in mind that most of the districts have only gone through the DP process only once; except for the three districts covered by ZVI, which are now on their second DDP and noticeably more experienced and advanced in the process. This difference between districts demonstrates that it would be beneficial for the other districts to be supported at least for the next DDP, to ensure that the understanding of the process is more deeply ingrained. Nonetheless, the strong commitment to, and ownership of, the planning process by both local and central government significantly enhances the likelihood of sustainability.

At the jamoat level, where the capacity is much lower than at the district level, further support would be needed to ensure that JDPs of a good quality will feed into future DDPs.

The extent to which districts are able to mobilise funding is also a key element to the sustainability of the DDP process; if only limited funding can be raised and only a small part of the plan can be implemented, then the benefits of the efforts put into consultations etc. will be limited and the incentive to continue with the process would be insufficient. While the MEDT planning methodology is expected to become mandatory, ownership and interest in the process is critical for ensuring that the planning process is implemented with rigour and leading to DDPs of a high quality. Nonetheless, as shown in Annex 14, the DDP implementation rates are generally quite good, albeit with significant differences.

Due to staff turnover, capacity building and training on the DDP process is not a one-off endeavour, if sustainability is to be achieved. Hence, O2 included the methodology in the curriculum of the Institute for Civil Servant Training (ICST), in order to ensure that government staff in the future is also trained and capacitated to facilitate the DP process. However, it is highly unlikely that ICST and MEDT will be able to provide the same level of training, mentoring and support for the DDP process as UNDP.

In relation to the TF, there are two aspects of sustainability: a) the sustainability of the sub-projects implemented, and b) the possibility to transform the TF into a more long-term mechanism to incentivise and support the DP process.

In relation to the sub-projects, and in particular the infrastructure sub-projects, there are some risks that can threaten their long-term functionality, including:

- As earlier described, de-facto centralised tariff setting means that it can be difficult to establish tariffs based on the actual O&M costs, and stakeholders agree that the centrally established tariffs are too low to cover O&M. The issue is complex and it is beyond the scope of this evaluation to describe the complexities related to the tariff setting. In the TF implementation, this issue was addressed by requesting beneficiaries (e.g. members of dehkan farmers associations) to commit to provide financial contributions for maintenance. The UNDP TajWSS project is addressing the tariff issue in relation to water and sanitation services at the policy level.
- High priority given at the local level to rehabilitating the extensive infrastructure left from the Soviet time. However, one reason for much of this infrastructure not working anymore is that without subsidies from Moscow, the financial capacity to maintain the infrastructure is insufficient. Hence, an important concern is whether there is sufficient capacity and funding to maintain all the rehabilitated, upgraded and constructed infrastructure in the districts, including TF sub-projects.

Considering the strong local ownership of the TF, there is potential for it to become a valuable medium term mechanism, which supports and incentivises the DP process, at least until the Government budgeting process becomes decentralised and aligned with the planning process. However, for the TF to be relevant in this context it should be a locally owned mechanism and not simply become a donor funded mechanism. Hence, it would require that government is willing/able to gradually assume full responsibility and fully fund it. The evaluation team saw indications of such willingness at the oblast and district level.

The BEE sub-component implementation is still in an early and piloting phase, so it appears not to be sustainable yet without further support. For example, district PPDs have only met twice, and do thus not seem fully institutionalised, and both PPD and LEPI were only piloted and not rolled fully out.

It should be noted that O2 was not an isolated intervention for UNDP; it was part of a process that UNDP started with earlier initiatives, and which UNDP

intends to continue in Tajikistan in the future.

**Conclusions:**

- A number of districts, but probably not all, now seem to have the capacity to plan and implement DDPs using the RGP methodology.
- Districts, which are now on their second DDP, are noticeably more experienced and advanced in the process. It would be beneficial for the other districts to be supported in at least for the next DDP process to ensure that the understanding of the process is more deeply ingrained.
- The strong commitment to and ownership of, the planning process by both local and central government significantly enhances the likeliness of sustainability.
- The capacity is much lower at jamoat than district level, and further support would be needed to ensure that JDPs of a good quality will feed into future DDPs.
- While the MEDT planning methodology is expected to become mandatory, ownership and interest in the process is critical for future DDPs and this requires that a good part of the DDPs actually be implemented. DDP implementation rates are quite good, albeit with significant differences.
- O2 included the MEDT planning methodology in the ICST curriculum to ensure that government staff in the future is trained in the DP process. But it is highly unlikely that ICST and MEDT will be able to provide the same level of support for the DDP process as UNDP.
- The centrally established tariffs are insufficient to cover O&M cost, and this may pose a threat to TF infrastructure sub-projects. O2 sought to address this by committing beneficiaries to provide in-cash contributions for maintenance.
- High priority given at the local level to rehabilitating the extensive infrastructure left from the Soviet time, but the financial capacity is insufficient to maintain the Soviet level of infrastructure. An important concern is whether there is sufficient capacity and funding to maintain all the infrastructure rehabilitated, including TF sub-projects.
- Considering the strong local ownership of the TF, there is potential for it to become a valuable medium term mechanism. However, for the TF to be relevant in this context it should be a locally owned mechanism and not merely a donor funded mechanism. The evaluation team saw indications of willingness at the oblast and district level to gradually increase government contributions.
- The BEE sub-component implementation is still in an early and piloting phase and is not sustainable yet.
- O2 was not an isolated intervention, but part of a process supported by UNDP, which UNDP intends to continue in the future.

**Recommendations:**

- Prepare a sustainability/hand-over plan for O2, which should be implemented from the onset of any follow-up programming. This plan could combine funding from DFID, UNDP and other sources, including

government resources. Such a plan should be a requirement of any extension provided to O2, or parts of O2, including the TF.

- Promote that ODP and DDPs include provisions to address tariff issues.
- Build on the experiences from TajWSS pilot projects with tariffs and cost recovery in TF sub-projects and DPs.
- Lobby for a reform of the current de-facto tariff setting mechanism.
- Promote the use of meters in irrigation and water supply sub-projects (also to reduce water wastage).
- Analyse in DDPs the level and types of infrastructure district governments and stakeholders can realistically maintain.
- Continue support for, and upscaling of, the BEE sub-component, especially district PPDs and LEPI.

#### **Lessons:**

- Support to more than one round of DDPs and JDPs enhances the understanding by local stakeholders of the process, DP quality and the ability to continue process without donor support.

#### **4.9 Potential for upscaling/replication**

O2 and its various elements show a strong potential for upscaling. O2 builds on experiences from other initiatives, which have been refined and adapted to the context in Sughd. Furthermore, approaches used in O2 are already being replicated in other initiatives, and further replication/upscaling is planned.

Development plans: O2's approach to development planning builds on experiences from other UNDP projects, such as ZVI. DDPs have also been supported in Rasht. The innovation in O2 was to expand planning to include the lower levels with JDPs and VDPs, and to further decentralise the approval of plans. Experiences from O2 have under TAPRI been adapted and replicated in Khatlon province. The MEDT planning methodology was updated with approaches from O2, and is now moving towards being adopted by Parliament, thereby becoming a mandatory circular/decreed and upscaled to national coverage. So far 30 districts have prepared DDPs with support from UNDP and 3 have prepared plans without donor support. Hence, 25 districts still remain to be covered. However, JDPs have up till now only been prepared under O2.

Hence, the development planning process can, and will in the coming years, be upscaled to national coverage. However, a challenge will be to cover all jamoats, and also the large number of mahallas, although there are experiences with local governments replicating mahalla committee (MC) approach of AKF/MSDSP (121 MCs in Isfara district, 36 in Kanibadam).

TF: In principle, the TF can be significantly upscaled, both in terms of larger geographical coverage as well as in terms of increased funding for individual oblasts and rayons. In the case of the latter, care should be taken to a) ensure that local government contributions can sufficiently match TF resources to ensure ownership, and b) to avoid construction/rehabilitating infrastructure beyond the local O&M capacity.

BEE: these activities should be allowed mature and be upscaled within Sughd before firm conclusions on their replicability can be made. However, the evaluation team sees no hindrance to their potential replication.

However, it should be kept in mind that Sughd Oblast has a stronger private sector than other regions. Furthermore, the capacity is generally higher in Sughd than elsewhere. Hence, any efforts to upscale/replicate should take this into consideration, e.g. in relation to the planning of technical support.

**Conclusions:**

- Experiences from O2 have already under TAPRI been adapted and replicated in Khatlon province.
- The MEDT planning methodology has been updated with approaches from O2, and is now moving towards being adopted by Parliament, thereby becoming a mandatory circular/decreed for all districts.
- Development planning process can, and will in the coming years, be upscaled to national coverage.
- A challenge will be to cover all jamoats and mahallas.
- The TF can be significantly upscaled, both in terms of larger geographical coverage and increased funding for individual oblasts and rayons. In the case of the latter, care should be taken to ensure that government contributions can ensure ownership, and to avoid infrastructure sub-projects beyond the local O&M capacity.
- Any efforts to replicate O2 should take the local capacity into consideration, e.g. in relation to the planning of technical support.

**Recommendations:**

- Efforts to upscale/replicate O2 (e.g. DP process, TF) should take the local capacity and context into consideration, e.g. in relation to the planning of technical support.

## 5 Overview of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

This chapter provides lists of all the conclusions, recommendations and lessons from the previous chapters. A summarised conclusion is provided in Chapter 1.3 Conclusion summary. Key recommendations and lessons are provided in Chapter 1.4 Main recommendations and lessons learned.

### 5.1 Conclusions

#### Partnerships and linkages

- UNDP has been very successful in creating synergies between RGP O2 other UNDP programmes in terms of: building on experiences, refining methodologies, addressing cross-cutting issues, and utilising existing structures.
- Collaboration with TajWSS on infrastructure TF sub-projects in relation to addressing tariff setting and O&M cost recovery could have benefited sub-projects.
- UNDP and GIZ coordinated efforts, but the scope for this was somewhat limited due to having different national implementing partners.
- The design logic of RGP was not sufficiently strong in practical terms to justify having O2 and Output 3-6 in the same programme. This has created some misunderstandings, tensions and frustrations, e.g. in relation to the role of GREAT and the future of O2.

#### Monitoring

- The RGP logframe did not provide sufficient detail to serve as a management tool guiding the implementation of O2.
- The O2 indicators in the logframe were output oriented and did not capture transformational changes, outcomes and impacts achieved by O2.
- UNDP carried out a significant amount of monitoring of O2 progress and also captured some economic outcomes, although much monitoring was output oriented.
- The oblast and districts monitor the implementation of their DPs and sub-project implementation, but are still facing capacity constraints in relation to M&E.
- Due to local government capacity constraints and limited time available for implementation, UNDP was very, and perhaps overly so, hands-on in TF sub-project monitoring.
- LEPI could prove a useful tool in monitoring changes in the BEE.

#### Budget and spending

- The funding provided for O2 has been spent within the implementation period.
- The allocated budget for O2 has generally been spent in accordance with the provisions in the budget of the Prodoc.
- The average UNDP/DFID costs for capacity building and support for the preparation of local development plans (DDPs and JDPs for some of the jamoats) in the district is less than USD 175.000 per district.



## **Development planning**

- The DP target was achieved; 14 DDPs and 65 JDPs were developed and the ODP (Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan) for 2012-2015 was updated.
- O2 worked on development planning at multiple levels (central, oblast, district, jamoat, mahalla).
- MEDT's DP methodology was revised to be more decentralised, localised, participatory and bottom-up; and cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, disaster risks reduction, conflict prevention, migration) and LED were incorporated.
- O2 has lead to a significant change towards more transparent and inclusive planning. However, there is still room for further improvements, e.g. in relation to the private sector.
- DDPs are quite comprehensive in their thematic coverage, but some quality issues remain, including:
  - A tendency to focus on "hard" infrastructure over "soft" management and capacity related aspects
  - Shortcomings in addressing crosscutting issues
  - A tendency to focus on projects with a short term perspective
- 47% of DDPs have on average been implemented, although there is significant variation due to differences in capacities and potential to attract funding from multiple sources (public, private, community, foreign investors, donors).
- Reportedly, districts with DDPs are able to raise much more funding than districts without DDPs.
- UNDP estimates that for every USD invested in DDPs, the return of investment is USD 99.
- The quality of JDPs varies significantly between districts.
- The extent to which JDPs have been implemented, and the ability of jamoat authorities to mobilise funding is not clear to the evaluation team.
- 226 MCs were capacitated and registered as formal public entities.
- All MCs were able to raise funds from members to implement priority projects from their VDPs, albeit the funding raised per person was modest (1.60 USD/person).

## **Trust Fund**

- The TF target was significantly surpassed; 131 sub-projects were implemented; the target was 21.
- TF was the principal RGP O2 mechanism for supporting the implementation of DPs.
- The TF provided USD 2,150,000 for DP implementation; less than 0.6% of the total funding mobilised for DDP implementation.
- TF funds were managed by Government under its procedures.
- Difficulties in setting up the TF while ensuring both government and UNDP regulations were adhered to caused significant delays; the MoU was signed in late 2011 and the funding was available in March 2012.

- From March 2012 to June 2013 two rounds of sub-projects TF funding were prepared and implemented.
- Fund allocations for the second rounds were performance based.
- Sub-projects were selected according to scores obtained against specific economic, social, financial and environmental criteria – but with a higher weight given to the economic criteria.
- Overall, the stakeholder contribution (especially from communities and in some cases private sector, in cash and in kind) for TF sub-projects was high, albeit with significant variations at the district level. The total contribution from government was 9%, the community and private sector contribution was 36%, and the remaining 55% came from the TF.
- Most TF sub-projects were infrastructure sub-projects; 85% of all sub-projects were on irrigation.
- Some sub-projects were related to environment, such as waste collection.
- 12 sub-projects focused on the mahalla level created 114 new jobs for women.
- The strong element of infrastructure projects has been an issue of debate, keen on infrastructure projects, whereas DFID's main interest is to focus on "soft" projects aimed at enhancing the BEE. The government and UNDP argue that infrastructure is a prerequisite for business, whereas DFID argues that infrastructure is expensive and other and larger funding sources are available for this.
- The short time frame available for TF implementation affected in some cases sub-project quality.
- Due to the limited time available, UNDP was very, and probably overly, hands-on in supporting TF sub-project planning and implementation.
- The ownership of the TF mechanism is very high at all levels of government, and there is a strong wish to continue the TF and willingness to gradually increase oblast and district contributions.
- The TF is attracting a lot of attention (compared to its modest size), to some extent at the expense of the overall planning process and capacity building. There could be an issue of managing expectations.
- The TF was an appropriate mechanism for supporting DP implementation.
- The TF demonstrated the ability of oblast and district government to handle donor funds.

## **BEE**

- The target associated with the BEE component of *implementing four initiatives at the local level to enhance business environment* was met.
- 14 district websites with some interactive e-governance elements were developed, and the oblast website was updated.
- PPD platforms were piloted in three districts.
- PPDs could potentially become a tool to enhance private sector involvement in DDP planning.
- LEPI was piloted in one district.
- LED training was included in training package for development planning.

- It is still early days for e-governance, district PPD and LEPI, and the results have not materialised yet.

### **Crosscutting issues**

- Environment, gender, disaster risks reduction, conflict prevention, and migration were mainstreamed into MEDT's planning methodology and the DDP preparation process; in the case of environment, it has a separate chapter in the DDPs.
- District ecological departments are now included in DDP WGs.
- Capacity building and training was provided to oblast and district government staff and DDP WGs on poverty-environment, gender, and migration.
- The environmental analysis in DDPs often appears to lack coverage of some aspects, and the environmental priorities in DDP do not always address the environmental issues identified.
- Two districts were supported in integration of gender in their DDPs.
- Gender is only covered strategically in two DDPs. In the other DDPs, gender is mentioned, but mostly in relation to health only.
- The TF sub-projects were screened by district ecology departments.
- The TF sub-project selection process included environmental and gender criteria, but economic criteria were given more weight.
- All DDPs mention disasters, but the extent to which an analysis is done and priority projects have been identified varies significantly.
- Some TF sub-projects specifically addressed environment or gender empowerment.
- UNDP estimates that 67% of the jobs created by the first round of TF sub-projects were for women.
- Five districts were supported in integration of migration in their DDPs.
- Migration is included/mentioned in the context analysis of all DDPs to differing degrees, but only some of them include specific actions/priorities related to migration.
- 7091 people were trained on migration and financial management.
- Reportedly, 40-50% of the contributions to village development funds (VDFs) were from migrant remittances, and a number of projects were implemented with contributions from remittances.
- 17,603 persons received legal counselling on migration.
- Over 30,000 copies of migration information materials were disseminated.

### **External factors – risks and assumptions**

- Some of the risks identified in the logframe have proven valid, but they have not significantly hampered O2 implementation.
- Most of the assumptions in the logframe have proven valid.
- The assumption that local governments would be given more authority in revenue collection and use of revenues was not valid, and this has limited their ability to allocate funds for DP implementation.
- A number of external factors, have influenced, or could potentially influence, the implementation and results of O2:

- Government budgeting and planning processes are not well linked, and budgeting remains centralised, so the funding that districts can allocate for investments is limited. Jamoats do not yet have their own budgetary resources.
- The legacy of centralised and top-down decision-making is still affecting the way that Government works.
- The de-facto centralised establishment of tariffs poses a challenge for the ensuring full O&M cost recovery, and can potentially threaten the sustainability of infrastructure sub-projects.
- Staff turnover in local government at both the technical and managerial/political level can affect the future preparation of DPs. It is unlikely that the Institute for Civil Servants Training's curriculum to ensure sustainability can ensure the same level of training and support as under O2.
- Corruption is a major problem in Tajikistan. Significant efforts have been made to ensure strong mechanism and transparency in the use of RGP O2 funding, but it can be difficult to ensure full protection from misuse of funds.
- With the upcoming elections, there is a risk that the TF is used for political purposes; although the established TF modalities would offer good protection against political selection of sub-projects.

## **Relevance**

- The focus and approach of O2 was very relevant in relation to the roll-out of new policies and MEDT's methodology on decentralisation and more inclusive and transparent development planning based on local priorities.
- The TF demonstrated the value of good planning and was also a means to strengthen the implementation capacity of district governments.
- Government stakeholders show a strong interest in, and feel a very strong ownership, of the DP planning process and in particular the TF.
- Communities show a strong ownership of TF sub-projects and seemingly also of VDPs.
- Private sector ownership appears somewhat mixed.
- That districts could access TF funds to implement sub-project of their own priority was instrumental for the creation of ownership.
- TH sub-projects tended to focus on fairly traditional infrastructure rehabilitation rather than strategically enabling districts to implement sub-projects addressing "soft" priorities, e.g. on BEE and crosscutting issues.
- O2 was aligned with UNDP's focus on poverty eradication and democratic governance.
- O2 supported the implementation at the local level of NDS and PRS.
- A challenge for O2 has been to balance the business/private sector oriented focus of RGP with local governments' broader mandate to

ensure both economic development and access to social services, and the strong interest in infrastructure.

### **Efficiency**

- Overall, the use of resources (human and financial) of O2 appears quite good.
- The implementation of O2 appears mostly as being timely and without significant delays in relation to the elaboration and support for DPs.
- TF implementation was initially delayed significantly due to challenges in reconciling government and UNDP procedures and rules.
- Two rounds of TF sub-projects were implemented in a short time frame.
- The use of Government's procedures for the TF has not caused significant delays.
- The delays with the TF have affected the cost-effectiveness in spending in relation to some sub-projects.
- Earlier initiation of district PPDs could have enabled them to be upscaled and contribute to the DDP formulation process.
- The use of CP as a mechanism for delivery of O2 appears to be an important reason for the timely implementation, and enabled the programme to benefit from already established UNDP AOs.
- While UNDP support was generally appropriate, UNDP has been quite hands-on and allocated significant staff-time resources.
- The average costs for capacity building, DP preparation (DDPs, JDPs, and VDPs) etc. was below USD 175,000 per district.
- With the significant funds mobilised for DDP implementation, UNDP has estimated the economic return on funds invested in DDPs at USD 99 per USD invested.
- TF sub-projects, UNDP has calculated the rate of return on the sub-project investments at 11.1 USD per USD invested in the first round of TF sub-projects.

### **Effectiveness**

- The output was delivered, although some areas still need further strengthening.
- The quality of the activities implemented generally appears good.
- The DP approach of O2 has enhanced transparency and inclusion of local stakeholders from the mahalla to the oblast level.
- The DDPs have proven a useful tool for mobilising both local and external resources for the implementation of development priorities, but their effectiveness and the ability to implement also depends on a better integration between planning and budgeting processes in the future.
- Many DPs display a good degree of implementation.
- There are still shortcomings in the conceptual understanding of "soft" issues, as well as BEE and crosscutting issues, and the ability to address these strategically and coherently remains limited.

- The DP model promoted has proven effective in mobilising local stakeholders, especially communities, although private sector involvement in DP processes could be further enhanced.
- District M&E capacity is still not sufficient to ensure that sub-projects are environmentally sustainable, and to fully ensure quality of investments.
- The TF has been an effective tool to mobilise government and community resources.
- The TF provided government with a unique opportunity to demonstrate its ability to be a partner for donors and to manage funds transparently.
- The TF was also an important incentive mechanism to demonstrate the value of good planning and for creating local ownership.
- Moreover, the TF appears to have been an effective mechanism for building the capacity of district governments to implement their DDPs.
- The implementation of the BEE sub-component is still in its early days so its effectiveness is yet to be fully seen.
- PPD could potentially become a tool for enhancing private sector involvement in the DDP process.
- O2 was fairly effective in *promoting a more fertile relationship between public and private sectors and to contributing to local development*, although private sector mobilisation was generally not quite as strong as community mobilisation.

### **Impact**

- The extent to which the DDPs have contributed to changes in terms of jobs created and enhanced production is not possible to assess, and the possible impacts of the new DP process are unlikely to fully materialise in the short term.
- TF funded sub-projects led to tangible changes for direct beneficiaries in terms of increased incomes and access to jobs.
- It is still too early to see impacts from the activities under the BEE sub-component.
- The TF has contributed to an improved BEE has been to enhance agricultural production and income for the direct beneficiaries.
- It is currently not possible to attribute changes in the BEE to the DDPs.
- It is not possible to measure the contribution of O2 to achieving the Goal and Purpose for RGP, but the evaluation team believes O2 as begun to contribute to this.

### **Sustainability**

- A number of districts, but probably not all, now seem to have the capacity to plan and implement DDPs using the RGP methodology.
- Districts, which are now on their second DDP, are noticeably more experienced and advanced in the process. It would be beneficial for the other districts to be supported in at least for the next DDP process to ensure that the understanding of the process is more deeply ingrained.
- The strong commitment to and ownership of, the planning process by both local and central government significantly enhances the likelihood of sustainability.

- The capacity is much lower at jamoat than district level, and further support would be needed to ensure that JDPs of a good quality will feed into future DDPs.
- While the MEDT planning methodology is expected to become mandatory, ownership and interest in the process is critical for future DDPs and this requires that a good part of the DDPs actually be implemented. DDP implementation rates are quite good, albeit with significant differences.
- O2 included the MEDT planning methodology in the ICST curriculum to ensure that government staff in the future is trained in the DP process. But it is highly unlikely that ICST and MEDT will be able to provide the same level of support for the DDP process as UNDP.
- The centrally established tariffs are insufficient to cover O&M cost, and this may pose a threat to TF infrastructure sub-projects. O2 sought to address this by committing beneficiaries to provide in-cash contributions for maintenance.
- High priority given at the local level to rehabilitating the extensive infrastructure left from the Soviet time, but the financial capacity is insufficient to maintain the Soviet level of infrastructure. An important concern is whether there is sufficient capacity and funding to maintain all the infrastructure rehabilitated, including TF sub-projects.
- Considering the strong local ownership of the TF, there is potential for it to become a valuable medium term mechanism. However, for the TF to be relevant in this context it should be a locally owned mechanism and not merely a donor funded mechanism. The evaluation team saw indications of willingness at the oblast and district level to gradually increase government contributions.
- The BEE sub-component implementation is still in an early and piloting phase and is not sustainable yet.
- O2 was not an isolated intervention, but part of a process supported by UNDP, which UNDP intends to continue in the future.

### **Upscaling/replication**

- Experiences from O2 have already under TAPRI been adapted and replicated in Khatlon province.
- The MEDT planning methodology has been updated with approaches from O2, and is now moving towards being adopted by Parliament, thereby becoming a mandatory circular/decreed for all districts.
- Development planning process can, and will in the coming years, be upscaled to national coverage.
- A challenge will be to cover all jamoats and mahallas.
- The TF can be significantly upscaled, both in terms of larger geographical coverage and increased funding for individual oblasts and rayons. In the case of the latter, care should be taken to ensure that government contributions can ensure ownership, and to avoid infrastructure sub-projects beyond the local O&M capacity.
- Any efforts to replicate O2 should take the local capacity into consideration, e.g. in relation to the planning of technical support.

## 5.2 Recommendations

### Partnerships and linkages

- Link implementation of DP infrastructure sub-projects to ongoing policy work and piloting under TajWSS in relation to tariff setting and cost recovery.

### Monitoring

- For programmes with a DP component, prepare a full (sub)logframe for the component, with impact/outcome oriented indicators, and adequate detail to be used as a management tool to guide implementation – even if this goes beyond donor requirements.
- Measure outcome/impact oriented indicators, which can capture transformational change/outcomes and be attributed to the DPP process (e.g. numbers of jobs created and amount of income generated directly as a result of DP priorities implemented (not only for TF sub-projects), the quality of DPs in terms of identifying and addressing key issues including crosscutting issues).
- Measure the quality and relevance of activities implemented (e.g. actual use of skills imparted through trainings).
- Develop a mentoring methodology for ensuring that local governments and stakeholders can monitor sub-project implementation and for gradually phasing out UNDP M&E – hence striking a balance of ensuring sufficient quality without UNDP getting too hands-on in the monitoring.
- Provide further capacity building for local governments and stakeholders on M&E of both project implementation and development indicators.
- Keep copies of both approved and rejected TF proposals in the files of oblast and UNDP.
- Bring urgently together the RGP team (UNDP, implementing partners, government) for a lessons learned analysis workshop, which can feed into the planned lessons learned report.

### Development planning

- Include planning, proposal development, monitoring and other formats used by O2 at the local levels in training materials.
- Translate the ODP (Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan) to English.
- Include in MEDT methodology a careful analysis of the level of infrastructure coverage a district (government and other stakeholders) has the economic and technical capacity to maintain.
- Build the WG capacity to better understand and include soft measures in DDP and JDP priorities/projects.
- Include a methodology for choosing priority projects in MEDT methodology, including projects with a long term perspective.
- Further increase the inclusion of private sector in the planning process and enhance the BEE aspects in DPs.
- Look into the way district and consultants support jamoats, and perhaps rotate consultants to ensure a more uniform quality of training.



- Monitor the implementation of, and fund mobilisation for, JDPs and VDPs.
- Strengthen the capacity to address environment and gender in DDPs, including formulating priority actions that address the issues identified.

### **Trust Fund**

- Continue TF but with increasing government contribution from oblast and rayons (in per cent and actual figures) for each round.
- Conduct an independent and in-depth audit of TF incl. sub-projects, so government can prove its capacity to handle donor funds.
- Identify alternative funding sources for TF (short and long term) as a key priority, to facilitate a more long-term perspective (e.g. five years).
- Have a maximum of one TF round per year.
- Ensure that a future TF much larger extent finances “soft” sub-projects, sub-projects addressing crosscutting issues, and projects specifically targeting BEE (e.g. through earmarking of funds).
- Provide strategic support to districts and jamoats on how to analyse and prioritise the BEE and crosscutting issues, and how to prepare sub-projects that address these.
- Demand clear business justification and analysis of the economic/BEE impact in any investments in infrastructure sub-projects.
- Include in TF modalities: a) mandatory environmental screenings/impact assessments, and b) preparation and implementation environmental mitigation plans – if mitigation is impossible, the sub-project should be rejected.
- Analyse the reasons behind the significant differences in local contribution levels to gain an understanding of the underlying dynamics.
- Disaggregate contributions from communities (incl. smallholder farmers) and private sector (companies).
- Broaden the support for DP implementation to go beyond TF, and providing capacity building, TA and mentoring in relation to projects for which districts and jamoats have secured funding elsewhere. This should be done with a particular emphasis on “soft”, BEE and crosscutting issues.
- Map available funding windows (government), which rayons and jamoats can approach for different sector priorities/intervention types.
- Map the priorities (thematic, geographical, target recipients) of donors (bilateral, multilateral, NGOs), and make available for rayons.
- Provide guidance to WGs on what soft BEE sub-projects and projects addressing crosscutting issues could entail, including providing tangible examples of soft BEE sub-projects.

### **BEE**

- Monitor district capacity to maintain and update websites.
- Monitor response times to queries and complaints submitted through websites.
- Link PPD to DDP process as a means to enhance private sector participation in the planning.

### **Crosscutting issues**

- Further strengthen the capacity to coherently address environment, disaster risk reduction, gender and migration in DDPs, including formulating priority actions that address the issues identified.
- Include climate change resilience and adaptation as a cross-cutting issue in MEDT's planning methodology and in future initiatives supporting DP processes. Climate change impacts should also be considered in relation to infrastructure projects.
- Include in TF modalities: a) mandatory environmental screenings/impact assessments, and b) preparation and implementation of environmental mitigation plans – if mitigation is impossible, the sub-project should be rejected.

### **External factors – risks and assumptions**

- Lobby for decentralisation of the Government budgeting process and linking it to the planning process.
- Lobby for jamoats getting small budgets for investments.
- Lobby for decentralisation of price setting (water, waste management) to be based on actual costs of investment and O&M.

### **Sustainability**

- Prepare a sustainability/hand-over plan for O2, which should be implemented from the onset of any follow-up programming. This plan could combine funding from DFID, UNDP and other sources, including government resources. Such a plan should be a requirement of any extension provided to O2, or parts of O2, including the TF.
- Promote that ODP and DDPs include provisions to address tariff issues.
- Build on the experiences from TajWSS pilot projects with tariffs and cost recovery in TF sub-projects and DPs.
- Lobby for a reform of the current de-facto tariff setting mechanism.
- Promote the use of meters in irrigation and water supply sub-projects (also to reduce water wastage).
- Analyse in DDPs the level and types of infrastructure district governments and stakeholders can realistically maintain.
- Continue support for, and upscaling of, the BEE sub-component, especially district PPDs and LEPI.

### **Upscaling/replication**

- Efforts to upscale/replicate O2 (e.g. DP process, TF) should take the local capacity and context into consideration, e.g. in relation to the planning of technical support.

## **5.3 Lessons learned**

### **Partnerships and linkages**

- A programme should not be treated as an isolated “island”; significant benefits can be obtained by linking to other programmes and creating synergies.

- When you have a programme multiple partners working on different approaches and with different partners, it is of critical importance to ensure the overall logic of the programme is strong, also in practical terms. It is equally important to ensure that the partners understand and buy in to this logic and the synergies to be obtained.

### **Monitoring**

- The logical connection between outputs within projects must be sufficient and practical – otherwise it may be better to split into more projects.
- Care should be taken to ensure that indicators monitored capture key outcomes and impacts.
- It is important to have a mix of quantitative progress indicators and indicators that capture the quality and relevance of activities.
- Building the M&E capacity of local stakeholders is important – monitoring should be done with them and the full responsibility for monitoring should gradually be transferred to them.

### **Budget and spending**

- Capacity building and support for the preparation of local DPs can be relatively inexpensive.

### **Development planning**

- Being the lowest government level with technical staff and (currently) own financial resources, the district level is a critical level for decentralised planning.
- The potential for implementing DDPs and mobilising funds is highly uneven among districts; this needs to be factored into the planning – and in the long run in the budget allocations from central government.
- Strong effort must be put into ensuring there is a good local understanding of the importance of soft issues and how these can be addressed. This includes building an understanding of when soft responses are better or more cost-effective than infrastructure.
- The economic implications of maintenance at the strategic/district level must be carefully analysed in relation to infrastructure investments.
- A continued focus must be kept on ensuring participation of stakeholders outside government, especially private sector (medium and large scale).
- It takes time and continued efforts to ensure that an enhanced understanding of crosscutting issues is also translated into coherent responses to these.
- The availability of (good) DDPs enhances the ability to mobilise funds from multiple sources.
- Jamoat capacity in relation to planning and especially implementation remains low. Even if they are provided with their own budget, they lack the technical staff to carry out plans without assistance from districts/higher level government. Capacity building needs at jamoat level is very high, but given the large number of jamoats, reaching them all is a major challenge.

- The quality of JDPs is primarily shaped by a) the quality of the training and TA provided by consultants, and b) the capacity of district governments to support jamoats. This should be duly factored into the planning of support for jamoats.
- Building the capacity at mahalla level enhances the ability of JDPs and VDPs to reflect the situation at the community level and enhances the community voice in the planning process.
- Strengthened MCs and VDFs facilitate the mobilisation of community resources.

### **Trust Fund**

- Local government, especially oblast authorities, have the capacity to manage donor funding.
- TF is a powerful incentive mechanism for preparation and implementation of local development plans, which can build strong local ownership of a decentralised and participatory/inclusive development planning process. However, this high level of attention can distract attention from the process it is intended as an incentive to support.
- Significant contributions in cash and in kind can be raised for TF sub-project implementation, but the contributions vary significantly among districts (probably depending on a combination of different local capacities and the type of the sub-projects).
- Sufficient time should be allowed for sub-project implementation to ensure that quality is not compromised.
- Local stakeholders tend to gravitate towards “hard” infrastructure projects as these are tangible, visible and within the “comfort” zone of stakeholders. This is further exacerbated in Tajikistan by the Soviet history, where there was high rural infrastructure coverage.
- Strong efforts are needed to promote “soft” sub-projects on BEE and crosscutting issues, otherwise local stakeholders will focus on infrastructure. This includes strategic support to enhance local government capacity to analyse and prioritise the BEE and crosscutting issues, and how to prepare sub-projects that address these.

### **BEE**

- Lessons are expected to emerge as the key BEE initiatives (e-governance, PPD, LEPI) mature and results emerge.

### **Crosscutting issues**

- It takes continued efforts over to ensure that an enhanced understanding of crosscutting issues is also translated into coherent responses to these in the DPs. Otherwise, there is a likelihood of them being merely being mentioned without being analysed and tackled in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

### **Sustainability**

- Support to more than one round of DDPs and JDPs enhances the understanding by local stakeholders of the process, DP quality and the

ability to continue process without donor support.

## Annexes:

Annex 1:	Terms of Reference
Annex 2:	Evaluation programme
Annex 3:	Persons interviewed
Annex 4:	Documents reviewed
Annex 5:	Outline of the main activity results by June 2013
Annex 6:	Relevant policies, laws and regulations
Annex 7:	Responses to evaluation questions
Annex 8:	Assessment of status of risks from Prodoc
Annex 9:	Assessment of status of assumptions from Prodoc
Annex 10:	OECD/DAC and UNDP definitions of evaluation criteria
Annex 11:	Output 2 logframe (May 2012 revision)
Annex 12:	Financial report on O2 expenditures (Jan 2010 – Mar 2013)
Annex 13:	Overview of Trust Fund contributions
Annex 14:	DDP implementation status per 1 April 2013
Annex 15:	District economic indicators 2010-2012

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

### TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

Evaluation of Output 2, Rural Growth Programme (RGP)

<b>Country:</b>	Tajikistan
<b>Description of Assignment:</b>	International Evaluation Expert
<b>Project name:</b>	UNDP Communities Programme
<b>Period of assignment/services:</b>	Part time over 2 months (40 working days on a non-consecutive basis), from May 1, 2013 to July 1, 2013
<b>Type:</b>	International Post
<b>Deadline for application:</b>	17 April, 2013

Interested candidates are strongly encouraged to apply online via website [www.undp.tj](http://www.undp.tj):

- In order to be considered in the long list of applicants please go to the [Registration](#) link, register your account and upload P11 Form. (If you already have a registered account, please use your login and password for further applying)
- Filled [Personal History Form](#) should be uploaded in your account. Please upload the exact P11 form instead of CV or Resume.
- Further, in the list of announced vacancies click on apply link beside the Vacancy post. You will be receiving a confirmation e-mail in short period to the address indicated in your account.
- Additional documents should be sent to e-mail address [ic.tj@undp.org](mailto:ic.tj@undp.org), for proper evaluation:
  - Proposal:
    - stating your interest and qualifications for the advertised position
    - Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work
  - Financial proposal
  - Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

Please note that incomplete applications will not be further considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

Candidates should submit the above-mentioned tender materials by 17 April 2013 via e-mail to [ic.tj@undp.org](mailto:ic.tj@undp.org). Title of assignment should be written in the subject line of the email.

### 1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Rural Growth Programme (RGP) in Sughd Oblast Tajikistan was a three year initiative, which ran from January 2010 – December 2012. It was a multi-sectoral programme based on partnerships between UNDP, DFID, GIZ, IOM and the Agha Khan Foundation. It was co-funded by the UK Department of International Development (DFID), the Deutsche

Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with DFID being the main funding organization, and UNDP and GIZ being the main implementing partners. The overall aim of the programme was to foster an environment for rural economic development in Sughd Oblast. The programme consisted of 6 outputs, of which the first was the inception phase. The remaining five outputs were as follows:

- Output 2: Improving capacities of local governance actors (particularly at rayon and jamoat levels) for local development planning with an emphasis on rural economic growth, including the implementation and monitoring of local development plans in line with NDS and PRS;
- Output 3: Facilitating access for producers/farmers and MSMEs to appropriate, professional, and sustainable business and technical advisory/extension services;
- Output 4: Supporting organized member focused business associations and their apex institutions in developing adequate and responsive services and advocacy support for its members;
- Output 5: Strengthening local vocational training institutions to meet local, regional and international market demands for better qualified labor and safe migration;
- Output 6: Facilitating access for producers/farmers, poor, women, and MSMEs to a variety of financial products and services available from Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs).

UNDP was responsible for coordinating overall delivery of the programme, and for implementing Output 2, while GIZ was primarily responsible for implementing Outputs 3-6 (with the involvement of UNDP). Outputs 3-6 were completed in December 2012, but work on Output 2 has been extended until June 2013. Output 2 has been implemented in 14 rural districts (Isfara, Kanibadam, B.Gafurov, Asht, Mastchoh, J.Rasulov, Spitamen, Shahristan, Gonchi, Istaravshan, Zafarabad, K.Mastchoh, Ayni, Panjakent) and 65 jamoats of Sughd Region. As work on this Output is now reaching its final phases, it is proposed to undertake a final review of all the work carried out under Output 2 over the last 3.5 years.

UNDP coordinated overall delivery of the RGP, and delivered Output 2 through its Communities Programme (CP), an umbrella programme with area offices in Sughd and other regions, which has been working at the sub-national level since 1996. Indeed, the design of Output 2 drew on past projects and lessons learned from the CP activities in Sughd and other regions of the country.

While Outputs 3-6 were concerned with direct support to business development in rural areas, Output 2 was focused on interventions, which worked with local partners to improve the enabling environment for business and economic development; or more broadly on building the institutional and social capital for achieving local development. The three main sets of activities implemented under Output 2 were:

- (i) support to participatory planning at the regional, district and jamoat level and formulation of development plans for these three levels. This involved the elaboration and implementation of a new planning methodology, with enhanced focus on targets and activities to achieve economic development at the oblast, district and Jamoat levels. Furthermore, UNDP partnered with the Mountain Society Development Support (MSDSP) programme of Aga Khan Foundation to introduce village development planning processes, through working with local community organizations (mahallas).
- (ii) support to implementing selected priorities outlined in the district and jamoat development plans, by creating a Trust Fund mechanism, which was jointly managed with the regional and district authorities to fund projects, selected through use of specific criteria to ensure that they were relevant to, and could contribute to local economic development; and



- (iii) support to enhancing institutional capacity at the local (regional, district levels) for creation of a more favourable business environment, through the piloting and introduction of elements of e-governance, introducing and promoting sustainable platforms for public-private dialogue, and capacity building activities for public authorities to improve their understanding of the possible tools and mechanisms at their disposal for promoting local economic development.

## 2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The evaluation is being conducted at the request of the UNDP and also of the main donor (DFID) in order to collect and analyze evidence on the relevance, implementation efficiency, impact and sustainability of activities undertaken under Output 2 of the RGP. Lessons learned, both positive and negative, will be formulated in order to inform future activities and project design, especially for programmes delivered under the UNDP CP. The evaluation will *inter alia* highlight possibilities for replication and scaling-up, and also lessons for adjusting similar activities being conducted under different projects related to achieving improved governance and institutional capital to promote local development. The lessons learned will also be used to inform the work of other donors carrying out related projects, such as GREAT (funded by DFID, implemented by GIZ, with the potential involvement of UNDP on activities similar to and building on those undertaken under Output 2 of the RGP). The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Project partners but also circulated more broadly among UNDP practices and the donor community in Tajikistan.

## 3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation will cover all activities carried out by the UNDP's CP in Sughd Oblast under Output 2, for the period January 2010 – May/ June 2013. It will assess progress in implementation against the targets set for Output 2, the efficiency with which outputs have been/ are being achieved, and their relevance to the overall aim of promoting local and rural development in Sughd Oblast, with special emphasis on evaluating the relevance, sustainability and impact of new approaches piloted under this Output, and their contribution to achieving the overall objective of the RGP. Particular emphasis will also be placed on evaluating the extent to which links were achieved with national development strategies, as well as synergies with the development priorities identified and pursued by the Tajikistan Development Coordination Council (DCC).

Overall, the evaluation will be guided by the commonly applied evaluation criteria of relevance/ appropriateness; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability and impact.

**Relevance:** concerns the consistency of activities and targets with national and local development programmes and national development challenges, and the needs of intended beneficiaries. It also relates to the relevance to UNDP's corporate and human development priorities, as well as the UNDAF<sup>1</sup> and UNDP country programme.

**Effectiveness:** refers to the manner in which the intended output targets were achieved. Measuring effectiveness will involve - to the extent possible - an assessment of cause and effect, and judging the extent to which observable changes be attributed to project activities.

**Efficiency:** refers to how economically resources (funds, expertise and time) were used to achieve results.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.untj.org](http://www.untj.org); [www.undp.tj](http://www.undp.tj)

**Sustainability:** refers to the extent to which the benefits of the activities will continue after the project has ended. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating to what extent capacity can be maintained.

**Impact:** from UNDP's perspective, this measures, to the extent possible, the changes in human development that are caused by the projects activities. However, impact evaluation usually faces a number of challenges, mainly because is very difficult to attribute impacts to certain activities, especially when a limited period of time has passed since implementation.

The evaluation should also be guided by the principles of human rights, gender equality, and the extent to which the implementation of Output 2 has respected considerations of environmental sustainability. When collecting data during site visits etc., evaluators should ensure that women and disadvantaged groups are adequately represented.

#### **4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONS**

The evaluation team will be composed of one international (Team leader) and one National expert.

Appendix 1 contains guidelines for the questions to be addressed in reference to each of the evaluation criteria mentioned above. They include some questions, which are specific to the task of evaluation the RGP. In their inception report, the evaluator(s) should finalize, in coordination with UNDP Tajikistan, both the evaluation methodology, the formulation of the set of questions which they will use, and the interviews which they will conduct.

Before the site visits the evaluation team should prepare and submit the inception report with the initial findings based on a desk review. Apart from reviewing the performance indicators used in the logframe for Output 2, the evaluator(s) will review all related project documentation as well as background information on Communities Programme, Sughd Oblast, and national development strategies. The following is a non-exhaustive list of the documents to be covered during the desk review, and which can be obtained on request from the CP team in Dushanbe:

- RGP Project Document
- RGP Inception Report and technical annexes
- RGP Annual Progress Reports (2011, 2012)
- DFID Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation
- CP Mid-term Review Report
- Minutes of the RGP Steering Committee meetings
- Knowledge products produced by the project, including success stories

After completion of the inception report, the evaluation will consist of on-site observations, interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders in Sughd Oblast and in Dushanbe. These will be conducted during a mission of max 20 days. At minimum, individual or group interviews should be conducted with representatives from the following stakeholders:

- UNDP CO management
- CP Staff
- National level Partners (Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, Statistics Agency, State Investment Committee, Institute for Civil Service Training)
- Donor partners (DFID, GIZ, IOM, Agha-Khan)
- Sughd Oblast executive body of state power
- Members of the RGP working group in Sughd Oblast
- District level executive body of state power (selection from the 14 where DDPs have been developed)

- Jamoat level authorities (where Jamoat Development Plans have been developed and the Trust Fund has operated)
- Partners from civil society and the private sector
- Communities where interventions to promote economic development have been implemented under the Trust Fund

At the end of the field trip/ on-site observations, the evaluators will provide initial feedback to UNDP including and DFID staff in Tajikistan, and if logistically possible to the project partners. Comments from these consultations will be taken into account when drafting the final evaluation report.

Since a wide range of stakeholders will be interested in the outcome of the review, the evaluators are requested to document case studies of particular interest in the final report, which can be presented as stand-alone examples of lessons learnt, both of positive and negative experience.

## **5. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)**

The International Expert will produce the following products:

- Inception report, to be completed before embarking on field trip/ site visits.
- a brief summary of main findings on completion of field trip (to be presented to stakeholders in Dushanbe/ Sughd)
- A final evaluation report including outcome, output impact analysis and Trust Fund implementation impact analysis
- a stand-alone document summarizing lessons learned, to be finalized in collaboration with the UNDP CP team

While the evaluator is free to choose their own method of reporting, the final Evaluation Report should be no more than 40 pages Font Arial, Size 12, and contain at least the following:

- Title Page
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Table of contents, including list of annexes
- Executive Summary
- Introduction: background and context of the program
- Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
- Approach and methodology
- Findings
- Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (including additional recommendations for future project interventions)
- Lessons learned, case studies

In addition, the final report should contain the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference for the evaluation

- List of meetings attended
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Any other relevant material

## **6. APPLICATION PROCEDURE AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

It is expected that International Expert will work for a total of 40 working days (including 20 days home work), of which a maximum of 10 days will be spent for field visits to Sughd Oblast, Tajikistan and 10 days for consultations and meetings in Dushanbe. The evaluation exercise is expected to be completed within an overall period of two months, and will commence on or around 1 May, and be completed by 1 July 2013.

The schedule of meeting with partners in national and local level (Sughd Oblast) will be further elaborated in collaboration with UNDP's CP team.

**Payment:** The applicant should include his/her financial offer in the written application. The financial offer should be a lump-sum which includes estimated expenditure for transport and accommodation during the field visits. The lump sum will be paid in three installments, with the first being made after signing of the contract, the second after submission and approval of inception report, and the third on satisfactory completion of the Final Report.

Applicant should include their financial offer in their written application

## **7. SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS**

The International Team Leader will be responsible for leading the evaluation process, putting together the final report and submitting it to UNDP and should meet following requirements:

- At least a Masters post-graduate degree in social sciences, in a field relevant to Rural Development, Agro-economics, Business Administration, Economics, or International Development;
- Over 10 years of extensive experience of undertaking donor evaluations and reviews (essential); experience of DFID funded projects is an advantage;
- More than 10 years of technical background in local development issues, pro-poor economic development, agriculture-led growth, private sector in development;
- Ability to make recommendations focused on results and impact, with a strong understanding of value for money concepts (essential)
- Knowledge of CIS, preferably Central Asia region (desirable)
- Effective communicator and report writer (essential)
- Excellent command of spoken and written English. Knowledge of Russian language is desirable

## **8. LOGISTICS**

The logistics support to the team will be arranged by UNDP/CP Dushanbe via Khujand and Ayni Area Offices.

Field work should be for at least 10 days, and should include visits to Zerafshan and other parts of Sughd Region.

## Appendix 1: Guidelines for the Evaluation Questions

### I. Project Design: Relevance of project, and extent to which original objectives remain valid

- (i) Does the project output address a relevant need? How was the baseline condition established at the beginning of the project? Was a needs analysis carried out at the beginning of the project to assess the needs of different stakeholders (specifically regarding Output 2)?*
- (ii) Did stakeholders take ownership of the concept and approach for Output 2? Was the design aligned with national priorities and supportive of the national development plan, as well as the priorities of the national partners, particularly those reflected in the long-term Tajikistan National Development Strategy till 2015 (NDS) and mid-term Poverty Reduction Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2010-2012 (PRS)<sup>2</sup>?*
- (iii) How well was the project output aligned with the overall UNDP mandate, and did it complement other projects in the country? How well did the project output complement and link to the activities of other donors, and fit within the broader donor context?*
- (iv) Is the logic for Output 2 coherent and realistic? Does the output link to the intended outcome, which is in turn linked to a broader impact or development objective? Are they based on a plausible causal analysis? Do the components of the output link logically to the planned objectives of the output, to the other outputs of the project, and the overall objective of the RGP project?*
- (v) Who are the partners and how strategic are they in terms of mandate, influence and capacity?*
- (vi) On which risks and assumptions does the output logic build? How realistic are they?*
- (vii) How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the progress towards achieving the output? Are they gender sensitive?*

### II. Project effectiveness and efficiency

- (i) Has the project output achieved its planned objectives?*
- (ii) Has the quantity and quality of the activities been satisfactory, and do the benefits accrue equally to men and women?*
- (iii) Are the project partners using the results of the output activity?*
- (iv) How have the stakeholders been involved in Output implementation? How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership for Output 2?*
- (v) Has the project been responsive to the needs of national partners and changing partner priorities in implementation of Output 2?*
- (vi) Has the project been responsive to any changes in the local context?*
- (vii) In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why is this, and what have been the supporting factors? How can these be built on?*

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.untj.org](http://www.untj.org); [www.undp.tj](http://www.undp.tj); [www.medt.tj](http://www.medt.tj)

- (viii) In which areas does the project have least achievements? What have been the constraining factors?*
- (ix) How effective have the innovative approaches introduced under Output 2 been in promoting a more fertile relationship between public and private sectors and to contributing to local development?*

### **III. Efficiency of Resource Use and Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.**

- (i) Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise) been allocated strategically to achieve the project output?*
- (ii) Were resources used efficiently? Were activities supporting achievement of the Output cost-effective? Did the results achieved justify the costs?*
- (iii) Were project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?*
- (iv) Were management capacities adequate to facilitate good results and efficient delivery?*
- (v) Did the output receive adequate support from its national and regional partners?*
- (vi) How effectively did project management monitor output performance and results? Was relevant information and data systematically collected?*
- (vii) Did the Output 2 make strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other UNDP projects and donors in the countries to increase its effectiveness and impact?*
- (viii) To what extent was the support provided by the UNDP CP adequate and appropriate? What are the advantages/ disadvantages regarding effectiveness of delivery of using the CP umbrella programme*

### **IV. Impact and Sustainability**

- (i) How far has the Output 2 made a significant contribution to broader and longer term development impact? What are the realistic long term effects of the project?*
- (ii) Can the Output 2 activities be scaled up?*
- (iii) What was the impact of TF implementation to the beneficiaries?*
- (iv) Can the TF mechanism be scaled up?*
- (v) Can the Output 2 gradually be handed over to national (regional) partners, and will they be able to continue the activities and take them forward? Are national/ regional/ district partners willing and able to continue with the activities?*
- (vi) To what extent were links to longer term national reforms articulated, propagated and achieved?*

## Annex 2: Evaluation programme

Time	Meetings/Focal Points	Venue
<b>June 2, Sunday Day 1</b>		
17:30	Arrival and accommodation	Atlas
<b>June 3, Monday Day 2</b>		
10:00-11:00	Meeting and work with CP Team	CP
13:30-14:30	Introductory meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Norimasa Shimomura, CD, UNDP</li> <li>- Aliona Niculita, DCD, UNDP</li> <li>- Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov, ARR/Programme, UNDP</li> <li>- Mubin Rustamov, PA, UNDP</li> </ul>	UNDP
<b>June 4, Tuesday Day 3</b>		
15:00-16:00	Meeting with DFID Shuhrat Rajabov, Programme Manager and Heloise Troc, Rural Growth Advisor	DFID
	Planning of the meetings, schedule of work and presentation of general outlines of the inception report	
18.30-19.30	Departure to Khujand	
<b>June 5, Wednesday Day 4</b>		
10:00-12:00	Partners' presentations on achievements under Output 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNDP, including PEI, AFT</li> <li>- 'E-governance' presentation by NGO Kova</li> </ul>	UNDP Khujand AO
14:00-15:30	Cont. Partners' presentations on achievements under Output 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- - MSDSP</li> <li>- - IOM</li> <li>- - GIZ</li> </ul>	UNDP Khujand AO
16:30-17:30	Meeting with Mr. J. Norinov for general presentation of achievements under Output 2;	
<b>June 6, Thursday Day 5</b>		
09:00-17:00	Field Visit to Kanibadam (MSDSP and IOM activities)	Kanibadam
<b>June 7, Friday Day 6</b>		
09:00-15:00	Isfara as donor district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting with DDP WG</li> </ul>	Isfara
	- PPD session meeting or visit TF funded project	
<b>June 8, Saturday Day 7</b>		
09:00-15:00	Spitamen as emerging donor district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting with DDP WG</li> </ul>	Spitamen
	- TF activities	
<b>June 9, Sunday, Day 10</b>		
	Desk work	
<b>June 10, Day 9 Monday</b>		
09:00-14:00	Asht as subsidized district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TF activities</li> </ul>	Asht
14:30-17:00	Meeting with AFT. Cooperation with RGP. Output 2.	UNDP Khujand AO
<b>June 11, Tuesday Day 10</b>		
09:00-11:00	Wrap up meeting with RGP WG, Mr. Norinov	Khujand Oblast
13:00	Trip from Khujand to Ayni	
16:00-17:00	UNDP Ayni AO presentation on achievements under Output 2	UNDP Ayni AO
<b>June 12, Wednesday Day 11</b>		
09:00-17:00	Panjakent as donor district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting with DDP WG, Mr. Domulloev Bobojon and others on PPD and TF</li> </ul>	Panjakent

	MSDPS activities (2 sewing workshops in Panjakent)	
	TF sub-projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pump station Dupula (TF1-2),</li> <li>- Pump stations Garibak and Navobod (TF2),</li> <li>- 2 Sewing workshops in Amondara and L.Sherali (TF2)</li> </ul>	
<b>June 13, Thursday Day 12</b>		
09:00-17:00	KM as subsidized District: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting with DDP WG</li> <li>Mr. Rizoiev Mahmadjobir and others on TF</li> </ul>	Kuhistoni Maschoh
	Meeting with the Head of the KM district	
	Meeting with the representatives of the Yaks project	
	TF sub-projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bridge in Khairobod Village (TF1),</li> <li>- Irrigation system in Esizi Poyon (TF1),</li> <li>- Irrigation canal in Obburdon Village (TF2),</li> <li>- Bridge in Valigond Village (TF2)</li> </ul>	
17:00	Return trip to Dushanbe	
<b>June 14, Friday Day 13</b>		
10:00-11:00	Meeting with Mr. Shukuhiddin Abrorov, Deputy Head of Department, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of the RT.	MEDT
11:00-12:00	Meeting with representatives of the NDS/LSIS Team	MEDT
14:00-15:00	Meeting State Investments Committee, Muminov Abdumajid, Department of state support of entrepreneurship	State Investments committee
15:00-16:00	Meeting with Shukhrat Igamberdyev 037, National Programme Officer TajWSS	UNDP CP
16:30-17:30	Wrap up meeting/presentation of results, UNDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aliona Niculita, Deputy Country Director</li> <li>- Gulbahor Nematova, Manager CP</li> <li>- Manuchehr Rakhmonov, Senior ED Officer, CP</li> <li>- Jurabek Sattorov, Senior LG Officer, CP</li> </ul>	UNDP
<b>June 15-16, Weekend (Days 14-15)</b>		
	Desk work	
<b>June 17, Monday Day 16</b>		
11:00-12:30	Meeting with IOM, Ozar Saidov	IOM Office
13:30-14:30	Meeting with GIZ , Hartwig Ungethuem, Zarina Kosimova	GIZ office
15:00-16:00	Meeting with Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Syuonhon Rustamov	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>June 18, Tuesday Day 17</b>		
08:30	Breakfast with Heloise Troc and Shuhrat Rajabov, DFID	Chaihona Rohat
<b>June 19, Wednesday Day 18</b>		
10:30-12:30	Wrap-up meeting	Conference room, UNDP
<b>June 20, Day 19</b>		
05:40	Departure from Dushanbe	



### Annex 3: Persons interviewed

Person	Position/Institution
Ms. Gulbahor Nematova	Programme Manager, CP, UNDP
Mr. Jurabek Sattorov	Senior Local Governance Officer, CP, UNDP
Ms. Aliona Niculita	Deputy Country Director, UNDP
Ms. Pascale Bonzom	Former RGP Coordinator, UNDP
Mr. Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov	Programme Coordinator/Assistant Resident Representative – Programme, UNDP
Mr. Mubin Rustamov	Programme Analyst, UNDP
Ms. Heloise Troc	Rural Adviser, DFID
Mr. Shuhrat Rajabov	Programme Manager, DFID
Mr. Manuchehr Rahmonov	Senior Economist Development Officer, CP, UNDP
Mr. Maqsud Aripov	Area Manager, Khujand AO, UNDP
Mr. Mirzo Mirzoev	Officer, MSDSP, AKF
Mr. Zafarjon Shafiev	VIT Kova
Ms. Gulshod Sharipova	Programme Analyst, Khujand AO, UNDP
Ms. Malikahon Nazarova	Deputy Head, Kanibadam District Hukumat
Ms. Gulsara Mamadjonova	Project Specialist, AFT, Khujand AO UNDP
Mr. Jabor Sattorov	Sub-national Project Specialist, PEI, UNDP
Ms. Dilbar Bobokalonova	Women and Society (IOM partner)
Mr. Rustamjon Kodirov	Leading specialist/Acting Head of Economic Planning Department, Kanibadam District Hukumat
Mr. Azalhon Alimov	Human Rights Centre
Ms. Kanoathon Juraeva	Head, Madaniyt Mahalla Committee, Kanibadam District
Ms. Anor Sharipova	Head of sewing shop, Madaniyt Mahalla, Kanibadam District
Ms. Musharaf Hasanova	Kanibadam District AO, MSDSP/AFK
Ms. Rohat Kayumova	Head, Dusty Mahalla Committee, Patar Jamoat, Kanibadam District
Mr. Farhod Tursunov	Head, Patar Jamoat, Kanibadam district
Ms. Dilafruz Mavlyanova	Economic Advisor, Khujand AO UNDP
Ms. Gulru Kayumova	Deputy Head, Department of Economy and Planning, Isfara District Hukumat
Mr. Ozifkhon Hakimov	Head, Department of Economy and Trade, Isfara District Hukumat
Mr. Ibodulloh Fattoev	Isfara District Hukumat
Mr. Mavlon Juraev	Deputy Head, Kulkand Jamoat, Isfara District
Mr. Bahoviddin Faiziev	Head, Waste Management Department, Obodoni Kulkand Jamoat, Isfara District Hukumat
Mr. Rahmoni Jamshed	Head, Execute Cabinet, Spitamen District Hukumat
Mr. Ismoil Niyozov	Head, Department on Development and Environment, Spitamen District Hukumat
Ms. Zulfiy Abdulloeva	Head, Economic Development and Trade Unit, Spitamen District Hukumat
Ms. Muhabbat Shernazarova	Head, Social Services and Pensions Unit), Spitamen District Hukumat
Mr. Abdurahmon Amirhonov	Guard, pump station in Toshkupruk Tagoiyk village, Spitamen District
Mr. Muhtor Umarov	Head, Kurush Jamoat, Spitamen District
Mr. Abdugafor Sohibov	Subcontractor/constructor of water supply system, Spitamen District
Mr. Abdurashid Jabborov	Adviser for the Head, Kurush Jamoat, Spitamen District
Mr. Turcunboi Kenjaev	Specialist/Secretary, Kurush Jamoat, Spitamen District
Mr. Faibullo Saifiev	Director, Water Supply Department, Oshoba village, Asht District
Mr. Erkin Abuvahobov	Subcontractor/constructor of pumps and water supply system, Oshoba village, Asht District
Mr. Nuriddin Umarov	Bookkeeper, Oshoba village, Asht District
Mr. Muhammad Dehkonov	Engineer, Oshoba village, Asht District
Mr. Shehozy Asisov	Leading Engineer/Water Controller Oshoba village, Asht District
Mr. Amiraly Boboaliev	Director, Asht Jamoat Water Supply, Asht District
Mr. Rasuljon Sobirov	Head of Department, Pumping Station, Asht Jamoat, Asht District
Mr. Rahmtjon Rajabov	Electricians, Asht Jamoat, Asht District
Mr. Farhodjon Rajabov	Electricians, Asht Jamoat, Asht District
Mr. Parviz Akramov	National coordinator AFT, Khujand AO UNDP
Mr. Firuz Hamodov	Area manager Aini AO, UNDP
Mr. Olim Kurbonov	Engineer, Aini AO, UNDP
Mr. Daler Nazarov	Programme Analyst, Aini AO, UNDP
Mr. Bobojon Domuloev	1st Deputy Head, Panjakent District Hukumat
Mr. Sanat Karobekov	Head, Investment and State Property Department, Panjakent District

	Hukumat
Mr. Kurbonmurod Usmonov	Head, water supply system, Amondara Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Abdullokhon Abdushahobov	Head, Huroson dehkan farm, Amondara Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Haqukul Bozorov	Head, Sherhon dehkan farm, Amondara Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Bozorboi Toshev	Head, Firdavsy dehkan farm, Amondara Jamoat, Panjakent District
Ms. Savriniso Ibodova	Head, Humor Mahalla Committee and sewing workshop, Loik Sherali Jamoat, Panjakent District
Ms. Anzurat Nuruloevna Ayozyva	Head, Loik Shealy Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Jurahon Rahimov	Head, Gazar Bahor water users' association, Loik Sherali Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Ibodullo Berdieorov	Head, Mullo Ibod dehkan farm, Loik Sherali Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Abdukaum Eyorov	Leading Specialist, Loik Sherali Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Kurbonmurod Mullousmonov	Head, water supply system, Panjakent District
Mr. Nusratullo Ismatov	Pump Engineer, Shing Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Zokirjon Aminov	Head, dehkan farm, Shing Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Mahkamboi Dustuv	Engineer, water supply system, Bokhcha village, Shing Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Rahmatullo Ismatov	Garden, department of water supply system, Bokhcha village, Shing Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Muhammadsharif Mirasilov	Mechanic, department of water supply system Bokhcha village, Shing Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Aziz Ikromov	Head, pumping station #5, Navobod Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Muteullo Romini	Operator, pumping station #5, Navobod Jamoat, Panjakent District
Mr. Suhrob Ohunov	Head of District, Kohistoni Maschok District Hukumat
Mr. Mahmadjobir Rizoiev	Head of WG, Kohistoni Maschok District Hukumat
Mr. Bobobek Sidebekov	Head, Basic Association Construction, Kohistoni Maschok District Hukumat
Mr. Abdujabbor Shoev	Head, Economy and Trade Department, Kohistoni Maschok District Hukumat
Ms. Nozukmoh Hamdamova	Specialist, Women Committee, Kohistoni Maschok
Mr. Idiboi Sharifov	Head, Department of Agriculture, Kohistoni Maschok District Hukumat
Mr. Sidik Ashurov	Head, dehkan farm, Valifand village, Kohistoni Maschok District
Mr. Mahmadschukur Karimov	Worker, Valifand village, Kohistoni Maschok District
Mr. Husain Ashurov	Worker, dehkan farm, Valifand village, Kohistoni Maschok District
Mr. Mirzosami Bokiev	Teacher, Ivan Tojik Jamoat, Kohistoni Maschok District
Mr. Iativ Navruzov	Farmer, Ivan Tojik Jamoat, Kohistoni Maschok District
Mr. Shukuhiddin Abrorov	Leading Specialist, Department for Development of Territories and Monitoring of National Program, MEDT
Mr. Mirzo Olimov	Head, MEDT/CP consultant team, UNDP
Mr. Khursandmurod Khakumov	Monitoring Consultant, MEDT/CP consultant team, UNDP
Mr. Dehkonov Jahongir	Planning Specialist, MEDT/CP consultant team, UNDP
Mr. Abdulmajid Muminov	Head, Entrepreneurship Support Department, State Committee on Investment and State Property Management
Mr. Kimatullo Abdulhmidov	Leading Specialist, Entrepreneurship Support Department, State Committee on Investment and State Property Management
Mr. Shuhrat Ibragimov	National Programme Officer, Tajikistan Water Supply and Sanitation (TajWSS), Energy & Environment Programme UNDP
Mr. Kurbon Saidov	Program Assistant, IOM
Mr. Harwig Ungethuem	Team leader, AFC consultants international/GIZ
Ms. Zarina Kasimov	Deputy Team leader, AFC consultants international/GIZ
Mr. Olim Boobokalinov	Expert, AFC consultants international/GIZ
Mr. Suynkhub Rustamov	1st Deputy Minister, Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Ahmadjon Kodirov	Head, Agro-policy and Food Security Department, Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Jumaboi Shomurodov	Leading Specialist, Department for Management of International Relations, Science and Use of Scientific Results, Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Parviz Juraev	Head, Agro-policy and Private Sector Support Department, Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Nematjon Buriev	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy Minister, MEDT
Mr. Jamshed Yunusov	Head, Department of Investments, Spitamen District Hukumat
Mr. Foteh Masumov	RGP Secretary, Sughd Oblast Hukumat
Mr. Muhammad Bodurbekov	AKF/MSDSP

## Annex 4: Documents reviewed

1. Evaluation of local economic performance indicators new approach and suggestions for further use (for pilot phase)
2. Don Van Atta, Bakhadur Khaydarov, Ibragim Shukurov. Functional Analysis of Agriculture Management System at the Local Level in the Republic of Tajikistan and Suggestions towards its Improvement. Final Report: Findings and Suggestions. 18 November 2010, UNDP
3. Evaluation guidelines. TF implemented projects. RGP
4. Project's Evaluation Gird. RGP
5. Trust Fund Regulation. Guidelines. RGP
6. Rural Growth Program FAQs on TF
7. Information bulletin. Wider Europe: Aid for Trade for Central Asia, South Caucasus and Western CIS – Tajikistan.
8. Planning at the local level approaches and lessons learned. RGP, UNDP, GIZ, DFID.
9. The role of the local governments in improvement of business environment. Experience and practice of RGP. GIZ, UNDP, DFID. 2012
10. Mainstreaming migrations in local economic development. Key issues and lessons learned. UNDP, DFID, GIZ. 2012
11. Living standards improvement strategy of Tajikistan for 2013-2015
12. The main monitoring indicators of the "Living Standards Improvement Strategy of Tajikistan for 2013-2015"
13. Brief guide on building a platform to promote dialogue between public and private sectors at the local level. UNDP, Dushanbe 2012
14. Proposal for a pilot of a local government based Local Economic Performance Indicator' (LEPI). Sep.2012
15. Rural Growth Programme Inception Phase Report (January - June 2010) UNDP/ GTZ 30 July 2010
16. Investment profile of Sughd Region. Tajikistan, 2012
17. Mainstreaming migration in local economic development key issues and lessons learned
18. The labour market and labour migration in the Sughd Oblast report (November 2011) IOM, 2011
19. MDGs, 2000
20. National Development Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period till 2015, 2007
21. Poverty Reduction Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2010-2012
22. Living Standards Improvement Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2013-2015
23. Concept on Investment Development Activities. 2012
24. Civil Code 1,2 parts. 1999
25. Tax Code. 2004, 2012
26. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Dekhkan Farms". 2006
27. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Public Procurement of Goods, Works and Services". 2006
28. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Public Self-activities Bodies". 2008
29. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On State Registration of the Legal and Individual Entrepreneurships". 2009
30. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On State Budget". 2009-2012
31. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On State Forecasts, Concepts, Strategies and Socio-Economic Development Programmes of the Republic of Tajikistan". 2009
32. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Villages Self-governance Bodies". 2009
33. The Constitutional Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Self-governance Bodies". 2009
34. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Food Security"
35. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Free Economic Zones". 2011
36. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Environmental Security". 2011
37. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Microfinance Organizations". 2012
38. The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan "On Public Private Partnership". 2012
39. Standard letter of agreement between the united nations development programme and the local executive branch of state power of Kanibadam town on the implementation of the rural growth programme when UNDP serves as implementing partner

40. List of working group members from the representatives of the private sector by districts/ UNDP documentations
41. Pirnazarova Muhabbat, Report. Preliminary Project Impact Assessment under 'Mobilization of Local Resources for Community Development in Sughd Region', as part of the Rural Growth Programme. April – 2012
42. Memorandum of understanding between the United Nations Development Programme and the local executive branch of state power of Sughd province of the Republic of Tajikistan
43. Promotion of dialogue on ways to address economic development at the local level: new perspectives and approaches
44. Response and clarifications \_RGP Output 2 evaluation. Rural Growth Programme: Evaluation of Output 2
45. RGP monitoring data (e.g. for impact, outcome and output 2 indicators, but also if other monitoring data is available)
46. Rural Growth Programme in Sughd Outlines of the main activity results by June of 2013
47. CPAP Programme 2010-2012. UNDP
48. Rural Growth Programme in Sughd region, Tajikistan 2010-2012. Revised Logical Framework approved 23 May 2012
49. Description of services rural growth programme / Improving Training Programmes For Local Authorities
50. Strengthening the feedback mechanism in the district level. Concept Note. UNDP Tajikistan Country Office. 2013
51. Business Perception Survey in Sughd Province of Tajikistan. Under the UNDP / GTZ Rural Growth Programme. Baseline Assessment Report. August 2010
52. Tajikistan local government system review executive summary . UNDP. 2012
53. Results Of Functional Analysis Of Local Government Powers In The Republic Of Tajikistan (Expanded Study Of 50 Jamoats) USAID Local Development Initiatives Project. September 2012
54. Financial Report On Expenditures (January 2010 - March, 2013) UNDP
55. Monitoring of DDP In Sughd Oblast for 1 April 2013
56. Table of proposals for sustainability Projects Trust Fund - 1, of the Rural Development Programme. UNDP
57. TF budget by districts. UNDP
58. APR Annex 2 - Proposed Revised RGP Logical Framework 23 06 2011
59. Annual Progress Report Rural Growth Programme, Tajikistan UNDP/GIZ, Dushanbe September 2012
60. Annual Progress Report Rural Growth Programme, Tajikistan UNDP/GIZ, Dushanbe June 2011
61. Annual Progress Report Rural Growth Programme, Tajikistan UNDP/GIZ, Dushanbe 2010
62. Overview of Progress and Challenges for Output 2 (Effectiveness and Efficiency) Quarterly Report for Q1 2013 DFID, UNDP and GIZ
63. Overview of Progress and Challenges for Output 2 (Effectiveness and Efficiency) Quarterly Report for Q4 2012 DFID, UNDP and GIZ
64. Implementation of District Development Programmes: Progress and Impact. UNDP
65. District Development Programmes: Introducing Feedback Mechanisms and Working to Ensure Sustainability. UNDP
66. Social and economic development Program of Aini District for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
67. Social and economic development Program of Asht District for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
68. Social and economic development Program of Bobojon Ghafurov District for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
69. Decision on the approval of Social and Economic Development Program of Ghonchi district for 2011-2015 from 30 June, 2011 No.6/5, Ghonchi town
70. Decree on social and economic development program of Isfara district for 2013-2017 From August 1, 2012 # 381 Dushanbe City
71. Social and economic development Program of Istarawshan city for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
72. Social and economic development Program of Jabbor Rasulov district for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012

73. Social and economic development Program of Kuhistoni Maschoh district for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
74. Social and economic development Program of Maschoh district for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
75. Social and economic development Program of Shahrison district for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
76. Social and economic development Program of Spitamen district for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
77. Social and economic development Program of Zafarobod district for 2011-2015 (Short version) Dushanbe - 2012
78. Jamoat Gulakandoz strategic development plan for 2011-2015. Rasulov district, Sughd province<sup>6</sup> Republic of Tajikistan.RGP, UNDP
79. UNDP. Jamoat resource centres/ UNDP Tajikistan
80. UNDP. Jamoat Resource Centers: a school of future leaders?/ UNDP Tajikistan
81. UNDP. Transformational change through introducing Public Private Partnerships/ UNDP Tajikistan
82. UNDP. Establishment and capacity building of JRCs as an approach to supporting development of civil society in Tajikistan/ UNDP Tajikistan
83. Gulbahor Nematova. Some reflections from my visit to Rasht valley last week April 17, 2013. UNDP Tajikistan
84. Gulbahor Nematova. Some reflections from my visit to Rasht valley last week 6 May 2013. UNDP Tajikistan
85. UNDP. LED Approach Training Program for Rayons and Jamoats RGP Tajikistan 2010-2012
86. UNDP. Agenda ToT Local Economic Development Workshop, RGP, Sughd Oblast, Tajikistan, 26th of January 2011
87. UNDP. LED Approach Manual for Working Groups in Rayons and Jamoats RGP Tajikistan 2010 – 2012 RGP, UNDP
88. UNDP. LED workshop Trainers' material UNDP RGP 2010 – 2012
89. UNDP. Rural Growth Programme Output 2 – Evaluation Mission. UNDP Communities Programme. June 2013
90. UNDP. Trust Fund Mechanism. UNDP Evaluation of Output 2 of the Rural Growth Programme UNDP CP. June 2013
91. UNDP. Rural Growth Programme Cost Benefit Analysis of Trust Fund Mechanism UNDP CP. June 2013
92. UNDP. Basic Cost Benefit Analysis for implementing RGP Mid-Term Recommendation: TF allocations to bypassw authorities and go directly to the beneficiaries. UNDP CP. June 2013
93. IOM. Ozar Saidov, IOM ACHIEVEMENTS WITHIN COMPONENT 2 OF THE RURAL GROWTH PROGRAMME
94. Mountain Societies Development Support Programme (MSDSP) a project of the Aga Khan Foundation, GRP/ Sughd – 2013
95. Elena Krylova. Report Elaboration of District Development Plans in the Rasht Valley: Analysis and ecommendations UNDP. Dushanbe March 2013
96. UNDP. Action Matrix of the “Living Standards Improvement Strategy of Tajikistan for 2013-2015” UNDP CP. 2013
97. Manual on elaboration and Implementation of the social and economic development programs of districts and towns in the Republic of Tajikistan. MEDT. Dushanbe 2011
98. DFID, Tajikistan Mid Term Review of the Rural Growth Programme in Tajikistan October 2011
99. UNDP. Recommendations under the existing programme (from the MTR):
100. DFID, Tajikistan Annual Review Process, Results & Recommendations Rural Growth Programme. Annual Review June 2011
101. UNDP. Act Annual Review. RGP. 1 March 2009 - 4 October 2012 UNDP CP. 2013
102. UNDP SC minutes. RGP CP, 2011-2012
103. UNDP. Technical annexes for Inception Report (26 docs.)
104. UNDP. Rural Growth Programme Trust Fund (Special Grant funds) Regulations
105. UNDP. TRUST FUND REGULATION. RGP, 2012

## **Documents in Russian – Литература**

106. Национальная стратегия развития Республики Таджикистан на период до 2015 года. Душанбе – 2006
107. Сводный Отчет Мониторинга проектов поддержанных в рамках первой и второй фазы Доверительного фонда ПСР. Период отчета: 01.04.2013 – 02.05.2013
108. Сводный Отчет Мониторинга проектов поддержанных в рамках первой и второй фазы Доверительного фонда ПСР. Период отчета: 07.01.2013 – 14.02.2013
109. Протокол испытания №5. Управление охраны окружающей среды Согдийской области. Аккредитованная лаборатория отдела аналитического контроля от 27 марта 2012 года.
110. Рынок труда и трудовая миграция в Согдийской области. Отчет (ноябрь 2011), ПРС, ЮНДП. ИОМ
111. Русский язык для трудовых мигрантов. ПРС ЮНДП. ИОМ. Душанбе 2011.
112. Таблица предложений по устойчивости проектов Доверительного Фонда - 1, Программы Сельского Развития. ЮНДП
113. Программный отчет (Финальный). Проект «Создание информационных интернет-порталов МИОГВ». Общественная организация Центр Информационных Технологий «Кова». Худжанд - 2013
114. Инвестиционные возможности согдийской области. Таджикистан, 2012
115. Стандартное соглашение между программой развития организации объединенных наций и местным исполнительным органом государственной власти города Канибадама о реализации программы сельского развития, где ПРООН выступает как исполняющий орган
116. Экономические показатели проектов 1-ой фазы Доверительного фонда в рамках Программы Сельского Развития
117. Восприятие бизнес среды в Согдийской области Республики Таджикистан. Аналитический отчет. Консалтинговое агентство M-Vector. 2012
118. Введение в разработку Программ социально экономического развития районов Республики Таджикистан. Учебный модуль. ЮНДП 2010
119. База данных по проектам Доверительного фонда в рамках Программы сельского развития (ПСР) по 1-му траншу. ЮНДП
120. База данных по проектам Доверительного фонда в рамках Программы сельского развития (ПСР) по 2-му траншу. ЮНДП
121. Программа социально-экономического развития Айнинского района на 2011-2015 годы. ПРС, ПРООН.
122. Программа социально-экономического развития Бободжон Гафуровского района на 2011-2015 г.г. ПРС, ПРООН.
123. Программа социально-экономического развития города Истаравшана на 2011-2015гг. ПРС, ПРООН.
124. Программа социально-экономического развития Джаббор Расуловского района на период 2011-2015 гг. ПРС, ПРООН.
125. Стратегический план развития джамоата Гулакандоз Дж.Расуловский р-н, Согдийская обл., Республика Таджикистан ПРС, ПРООН
126. План социально экономического развития джамоата Янгихаёт, Джаббор Расуловского района Согдийской области на 2011-2015 годы. ПРС, ПРООН
127. План социально экономического развития джамоата Узбеккишлак, Джаббор Расуловского района Согдийской области на 2011-2015 годы ПРС, ПРООН
128. Программа социально-экономического развития района Кухистони Мастчоҳ Согдийской области на 2011-2015 годы. ПРС, ПРООН
129. Программа социально-экономического развития г.Канибадам на период 2011-2015гг. . ПРС, ПРООН
130. Программа социально-экономического развития Мастчинского района на период 2011-2015 гг. ПРС, ПРООН
131. Программа социально-экономического развития города Пенджикент на 2011-2015 годы ПРС, ПРООН
132. Программа развития Шахристанского района на период 2011- 2015гг. ПРС, ПРООН
133. Программа социально-экономического развития Спитаменского района на 2011-2015 годы. ПРС, ПРООН
134. Программа социально-экономического развития Зафарабадского района на 2011-2015 годы. ПРС, ПРООН

135. ПРООН. Учебное руководство. включение вопросов бедности и окружающей среды в Таджикистане. 2012

**Documents in Tajik – Адабиётҳо**

136. Рӯихати идеяҳои лоиҳавӣ, ки аз тарафи фаъолони ноҳия пешниҳод шудааст.
137. Сомонаҳои расмии МИХД – кадами нахустин ба сӯи Ҳукумати электронӣ» (маводҳои тақсимоӣ барои шахсони масъули МИХД шаҳру навоҳӣ барои кори сомонаҳо, ТҶ Маркази технологияҳои иттилоотии «Кова». Хучанд, 2013
138. Дастурамал барои истифодабарии қисми маъмурии сомонаҳои МИХД шаҳру навоҳӣ барои кори сомонаҳои - superadmin (маводҳои тақсимоӣ барои шахсони масъули МИХД шаҳру навоҳӣ барои кори сомонаҳо, ТҶ Маркази технологияҳои иттилоотии «Кова». Хучанд, 2013
139. Барномаи рушди иҷтимоию иқтисодии ноҳияи Спитамен барои солҳои 2011-2015. Мақомоти иҷроияи ҳокимияти давлатии ноҳияи Спитаменӣ вилояти Суғд. Душанбе, 2012
140. Роҳнамо пеш аз сафар барои муҳоҷирони меҳнати. МСБМ дар Ҷумҳурии Тоҷикистон. 2011
141. CD – disk Роҳнамо пеш аз сафар барои муҳоҷирони меҳнати. МСБМ дар Ҷумҳурии Тоҷикистон. 2011
142. Протокол-и чаласаи аъзоёни Комиссия оид ба баҳодиҳии лоиҳаҳои давраи 2-ми Фонди Боварӣ, 12.09.2012, Хучанд
143. Протокол-и чаласаи аъзоёни Комиссия оид ба баҳодиҳии лоиҳаҳои давраи 2-ми Фонди Боварӣ, 17.09.2012, Хучанд
144. Протокол-и чаласаи аъзоёни Комиссия оид ба баҳодиҳии лоиҳаҳои давраи 2-ми Фонди Боварӣ, 21.09.2012, Хучанд
145. Нақшаи маблағгузори аз буҷети вилояти мувофиқи Меморандуми ҳамкорӣ байни мақомоти иҷроияи ҳокимияти давлатии вилоят ва Барномаи Рушди Созмони Миллалӣ Муттаҳид аз 28.11.2012
146. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 8 ғамоатҳои ноҳияи Ашт барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
147. солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
148. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 5 ғамоатҳои ноҳияи Айни барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
149. солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
150. Барномаи рушди илтимои-иқтисодии ноҳияи Бобоҷон Ғафуров барои солҳои 2011-2015 БРД БРСММ
151. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 7 ғамоатҳои ноҳияи Бобоҷон Ғафуров барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
152. солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
153. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 4 ғамоатҳои ноҳияи Ғонҷӣ барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
154. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 8 ғамоатҳои шаҳри Исфараӣ барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
155. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 6 ғамоатҳои шаҳри Истаравшан барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
156. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодӣ – илтимои ғамоати деҳоти Гулхона барои солҳои 2011-2015. Ёумњурии Тоҷикистон, вилояти Суғд, ноҳияи Ёаббор Расулов. БРД БРСММ
157. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодӣ-илтимои Ғамоати деҳоти «Иван-Тоҷик» барои солҳои 2011-2015 (ноҳияи Куҷистони Мастҷон, вилояти Суғд, Ёумњурии Тоҷикистон). БРД БРСММ
158. Нақшаи рушди иқтисоди-илтимои ғамоати деҳоти Лангар барои солҳои 2011-2015 (ноҳияи Куҷистони Мастҷон вилояти Суғд Ёумњурии Тоҷикистон). БРД БРСММ
159. Барномаи рушди и\_тимоию иқтисодии шаҳри Конибодом бо ғамкорӣ ва дастгирии молиявӣ Барномаи рушди Созмони Миллалӣ Муттаҳид, Вазорати Рушди айналмиллалӣ Бритониёи Кабир ва Агентии Олмон оид ба ғамкории байналмиллалӣ тағия шудааст. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 4 ғамоатҳои ноҳияи Ғонҷӣ барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
160. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 4 ғамоатҳои шаҳри Конибодом барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ

161. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 3 ҷамоатҳои ноҳияи Мастчоҳ барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
  162. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 8 ҷамоатҳои шаҳри Панҷакент барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
  163. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 2 ҷамоатҳои ноҳияи Шаҳристон барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
  164. Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 4 ҷамоатҳои ноҳияи Спитамен барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ
- Нақшаи рушди иқтисодию илтимои 3 ҷамоатҳои ноҳияи Зафаробод барои солҳои 2011-2015. БРД БРСММ



## Annex 5: Outline of the main activity results by June 2013

### Rural Growth Programme in Sughd Outline of the main activity results by June 2013<sup>3</sup>

<p><i>Output 2</i>  <i>Improved capacities of local governance actors (particularly at Rayon and Jamoat levels) for local development planning, implementation and monitoring in line with NDS and PRS and with the emphasis on support to rural economic growth</i></p>	
<p><b>UNDP activities</b></p>	<p><b><i>Introduction of local planning process, its monitoring and implementation through the Trust Fund mechanism and strengthening the capacities of local actors.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 District Development Plans (DDPs) and 65 Jamoat Development Plans were finalized and implementation started. Trainings on DDP M&amp;E and Resource Mobilization implemented. Regular monitoring of implementation of DDPs conducted. Public hearings of results of DDPs implementation conducted.</li> <li>• General LED (Local Economic Development) training and integration of LED into the planning process were conducted for the representatives of the Working Groups in all 14 districts.</li> <li>• The e-DB developed and installed in each Jamoat and district statistic office. Capacity of local statisticians enhanced to use the database and its electronic software. (involvement of State Statistics Agency)</li> <li>• ICST conducted ToTs for the teachers on planning methodology; LED and later on the modules were included into the curricula of the institute for further trainings of public servants and masters programme.</li> <li>• Sughd Oblast Social Economic Plan for 2012-2015 is updated.</li> <li>• The national level local development planning methodology updated and approved by the MEDT.</li> <li>• Regional WG for review for TF projects and the Regional Committee for Approval of TF projects established. 131 projects under the TF mechanism supported. Regular joint monitoring with the reps of Regional Government done. Internal evaluation of the progress of TF1 projects done. Articles on TF success stories published. SOP on TF Management and Evaluation developed.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Business Enabling Environment at the local level.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About 60 representatives of public and private sector trained in conducted trainings on Regulatory Impact Analysis and Preparing and Evaluating Investment Project techniques.</li> <li>• The two round Business perception survey conducted and results were communicated with the regional level public and private dialogue platform.</li> <li>• Consultations with entrepreneurs of Sughd Oblast on 2 Draft Laws "On Support and Development of entrepreneurship" and "Amendments to the Law On Inspections" conducted and recommendations were provided to the State Committee on Investments and State Property Management of RT</li> <li>• The introduction of e-governance elements in 14 districts of Sughd Oblast has been initiated and 14 web sites with feedback mechanism have been introduced.</li> <li>• The brief guide on Public and Private Dialogue is prepared and disseminated among development partners</li> <li>• 3 local level public and private dialogue platforms are established and operational in Isfara, Istaravshan and Panjakent districts. These PPDs are linked vertically with the regional and national level platforms.</li> <li>• The Investment Opportunities of Sughd Oblast (profile) developed and</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Table prepared by Communities Programme, UNDP Tajikistan

	<p>disseminated among the wider group of stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trainings on the Local Economic Development aspects such as analysis of local economy, preparation of investment projects, public and private dialogue, public and private partnership, investments promotion, export and trade promotion were conducted for 563 participants (including 134 women)</li> <li>• The negotiations for LEPI (Local Economic Performance Indicators) introductions are being carried out and pilot phase is ongoing.</li> <li>• 2 knowledge products on the local planning and business environment enabling were elaborated and disseminated as well as two films and talk shows were produced and broadcasted</li> <li>• # of articles, success stories on the results of the programme and especially component 2 implementation were published in the local and national newspapers and posted in the web sites.</li> </ul>
<i>MSDSP activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 226 mahalla committees registered as public organizations, capacity building activities conducted and strengthened;</li> <li>• 121 additional MCs in Isfara district (recorded at Jamoat level);</li> <li>• 36 additional MCs in Kanibadam district (to be recorded at Jamoat level).</li> <li>• All 226 MCs established Village Development Funds (VDF)</li> <li>• TJS 2,200,000 contributed to VDF by MCs participants;</li> <li>• MCs spent TJS 1,700,000 from VDF for the implementation of over 600 development activities.</li> <li>• 226 Village Development Plans (VDP) developed;</li> <li>• In average, one economic initiative was implemented by each MCs with funds from their VDFs;</li> <li>• VDP priorities are incorporated into Jamoat Development Plans (JDP).</li> <li>• USD 285,000 invested into 7 VDP priority projects through TF mechanism (JDP, DDP);</li> <li>• MCs developed 12 Common Interest Groups (CIG) for implementing projects focused on women economic empowerment with funding support from TF;</li> <li>• USD 110,000 from TF disbursed (100,000 from RGP funds and 10,000 contribution from the Oblast Administration) for implementation of 12 MC projects directed on women economic empowerment.</li> </ul>
<i>IOM</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essentials of Migration Management (EMM) – is a globally recognized reference handbook for policy makers and practitioners – applied for capacity building of state structures in all districts located in Sughd Oblast;</li> <li>• A total of 16 EMM trainings were hosted for 398 officials (149 female).</li> <li>• Session on mainstreaming migration into development planning was delivered to oblast development planning team;</li> <li>• 2 consultants were hired to facilitate discussion and provide advisory in target areas;</li> <li>• Migration is practically mainstreamed into 5 district development planning tools.</li> <li>• 31 CB trainings on Effective Family Budget Management – 894 participants (406 females);</li> <li>• 31 CB trainings on Effective Use of Remittances for Community Development - 920 participants (396 females);</li> <li>• 10 TOT on Counseling and Informing Labour Migrants - 237 participants (112 females).</li> <li>• Mahalla Committee representatives were involved to CB trainings to further mobilize voluntary investment of migrant remittances for community projects;</li> <li>• Nearly 40-50% of village development funds are composed of migrant remittances.</li> <li>• Several successful projects funded with the injection of migrant resources (for ex., water supply line in Jamoat Navgilem (Isfara), bridge construction in Jamoat Madaniyat (Konibodom), village road pavement in Jamoat Puloton (Konibodom)).</li> <li>• Total number of trainings delivered by all NGOs: 285;</li> <li>• Total number of NGO-trained beneficiaries: 7,091 (M:3,622; F:3,469);</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total number of counselling provided: 17,603 (M:11,974; F:5,629);</li> <li>• Total number of info materials disseminated: over 30,000.</li> <li>• Pre-departure orientation handbook for labour migrants;</li> <li>• Pre-departure orientation video film “Know before traveling!”;</li> <li>• Referral cards to refer applicants for obtaining quality information on migration issues;</li> <li>• Leaflets “Legal migration is the guarantee of your success” and “Friendly advices to labour migrants”.</li> <li>• The book “Russian language for migrants” has been elaborated and disseminated.</li> </ul>
<i>Cross-cutting: AFT, PEI and UN Women</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business associations supported through Business Challenge Fund, established through Aid for Trade Project;</li> <li>• Institutional and organizational capacity of BAs and their apex institutions strengthened through AFT Project;</li> <li>• PEI approach mainstreamed in all developed DDPs and JDPs;</li> <li>• PEI focused projects supported through the Trust Fund mechanism;</li> <li>• Capacity of the state agencies, providing extension services and MFIs, enhanced, and the environmental screening tool introduced;</li> <li>• Screening of 2 DDPs, with account of gender inclusion, done and relevant indicators introduced;</li> <li>• Statistics DB improved.</li> </ul>

## Annex 6: Relevant policies, laws and regulations

#	Law /strategic papers <sup>4</sup>	Date of adoption
<b>Strategic documents</b>		
1	<b>MDGs. Among the 8 goals of MDG, 3 applies to the activities of RGP:</b> Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger  Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women  Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability	2000
2	<b>National Development Strategy (NDS) of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period till 2015</b>  The activities under the RGP were designed to support implementation of the priorities identified in the NDS. For instance, the public administration reform, private sector development, development of the real sectors of economy, human development, social sector development, environmental sustainability and etc.	2007
3	<b>Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2010-2012</b>  This is a midterm development programme to support the implementation of NDS, so the above-mentioned direction applies for PRS. RGP supported the implementation of the priorities for the mid-term period.	Feb 2010
4	<b>Living Standards Improvement Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2013-2015</b>  The same [as for PRS] applies here, as this is a new mid-term development strategy.	Dec 2012
5	<b>Concept on State Policy on Investment Promotion and Protection</b>  The concept identifies the main directions of the investment promotion activities, incentives for the investments, improving the investment activities in the national and local levels, eliminating the investments barriers, informational provision of the investments activities and etc. RGP beneficiaries will use the benefits of the concept while promoting the investment activities in their territories.	2012
<b>Legal and normative acts</b>		
1	<b>Civil Code 1,2 parts</b>  The Civil Code stipulates the basics the main civil- legal relations, i.e. as a physical and legal entity, the property rights, organizations, funds, transactions and etc. All other Laws and Regulations are based on the Civil Code norms and regulations.	1999
2	<b>Tax Code</b>  The Tax Code is the main document, which provides the rates and the procedures of the taxation as well as identifies national and local level taxes. It applies to all economic entities, budgetary and non commercial organizations including funds.	2004, 2012
3	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Dekhkan Farms”</b>  The Law regulates the creation and development of dekhkan farms in the	2009

<sup>4</sup> Table prepared by Communities Programme, UNDP Tajikistan

	agricultural sector, which are widely represented in the rural areas and considers as a main employment opportunities. According to this Law the physical entities with the allocated lands can create the dekhkan farms as a legal form of the conducting the activities.	
4	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Public Procurement of Goods, Works and Services”</b>  The Trust Fund mechanism of the RGP was initiated used the norms and provisions of this Law. All tenders were conducted based on this regulation by the local authorities.	2006
5	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Public Self-activities Bodies”</b>  The Law regulates the activities of the mahalla committees as a public self-activity Bodies. It regulates the procedures of their creation and deregistration as well as the direction of the activities.	2008
6	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On State Registration of the Legal Entities and Individual Entrepreneurships”</b>  The Law stipulates the terms, procedures of business entities registration and their voluntary close. The registration functions were provided to the Tax Committee in 54 registration offices widely represented in all districts of Tajikistan. RGP promoted the access to the information (as one of the public services) to the business entities on the starting and closing the businesses and discuss possible issues during the PPD sessions.	2009
7	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On State Budget” (adopted in annual base)</b>  The Law on State Budget provides annual allocation of state expenses to the various needs of the state, including the budgets for the sectors needs, the oblasts and districts, grants and credits. The Law on State Budget provides the opportunities to the districts on attraction of funds for the implementation of their priorities identified in DDPs and JDPs.	2009, 2010, 2011, 2012
8	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On State Forecasts, Concepts, Strategies and Socio-Economic Development Programmes of the Republic of Tajikistan”</b>  This Law provides the framework on the development of national and local level strategies, concepts, programmes and plans. Within the RGP the necessary amendments were introduced to this Law, which stipulates the obligatory norms for the local territories to have their own development programmes/plans	Mar 2009
9	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Villages Self-governance Bodies”</b>  This Law was one of the key frameworks for the development within the RGP. The Law provides the aspects of self-governance at the local level (jamoats) including their rights/mandate and responsibilities.	2009
10	<b>The Constitutional Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Local Bodies of State Power”</b>  This Law regulates the rights/mandate and responsibilities of the local authorities at the oblast and district levels. The Law was used for the initiation of Trust Fund, Councils in the local level and etc.	2009
11	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Food Security”</b>  The law stipulates the main aspects of the food security such as basis for the food security in the country by development of agricultural sector, sector diversification and etc.	2010

12	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Free Economic Zones”</b>  This Law stipulates the legal frame of creation and development of free economic zones as a separate economic development territories. In the context of RGP the FEZ in Sughd was considered as an opportunity for the promoting the Sughd Oblast as investments attractable territory, which is also included into the Sughd Oblast Development Plan.	2011
13	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Environmental Security”</b>  This Law stipulates the norms relating to the sustainable development by consideration of environmental issues. The environment became a basic requirement in order to achieve the sustainable development in conjunction with economic and social sustainability.	2011
14	<b>The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Public Private Partnership”</b>  This Law was discussed among the RGP partners and it directly relates to the initiation of local level PPP projects such as managing the communal services, provision of drinking water etc.	2012

## Annex 7: Responses to evaluation questions

<b>I. Project Design: Relevance of project, and extent to which original objectives remain valid</b>	
<p><i>(i) Does the project output address a relevant need?</i></p> <p><i>How was the baseline condition established at the beginning of the project?</i></p> <p><i>Was a needs analysis carried out at the beginning of the project to assess the needs of different stakeholders (specifically regarding Output 2)?</i></p>	<p>Yes – O2 focused on enhancing the capacity of local government to lead the development and implement development plans in a participatory manner, taking local priorities and needs into account.</p> <p>The baseline information available appears limited in scope – some baseline information is included in the inception report logframe for the indicators, but no baseline study/report was carried out/prepared. Baseline information was derived from ZVI and on the DP status from MEDT.</p> <p>The needs analysis appears to be based on the experiences of the predeceasing ZVI, which covered 3 districts of Sughd. No report was prepared on the needs analysis, other than the Prodoc and the Inception Report.</p>
<p><i>(ii) Did stakeholders take ownership of the concept and approach for Output 2?</i></p> <p><i>Was the design aligned with national priorities and supportive of the national development plan, as well as the priorities of the national partners, particularly those reflected in the long-term Tajikistan National Development Strategy till 2015 (NDS) and mid-term Poverty Reduction Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for the period 2010-2012 (PRS)<sup>5</sup>?</i></p>	<p>Strong commitment from local government to DDP/JDP process. Very strong commitment from government (central, oblast, local) and beneficiary communities at all levels to TF. Private sector involvement could be further enhanced.</p> <p>Yes, O2 focused on building local government capacity to assume the roles and responsibilities outlined in legislation related to the ongoing decentralisation in Tajikistan. The local development plans developed are linked to NDS and PRS priorities.</p>
<p><i>(iii) How well was the project output aligned with the overall UNDP mandate, and did it complement other projects in the country?</i></p> <p><i>How well did the project output complement and link to the</i></p>	<p>It was well aligned with UNDP's mandate of poverty eradication by focusing on income generation, as well as UNDP's focus on democratic governance. It supported the implementation of NDS and PRS, in was thus linked to achieving the MDGs. O2 built on a methodology also applied by UNDP in other projects and locations (e.g. in ZVI, Khatlon).</p> <p>O2 was not directly linked to the activities of other donors at the local level. It was however linked to</p>

<sup>5</sup> [www.untj.org](http://www.untj.org); [www.undp.tj](http://www.undp.tj); [www.medt.tj](http://www.medt.tj)

<i>activities of other donors, and fit within the broader donor context?</i>	donor support for government reform, such as the agrarian reform and public administration reform, improving government capacity and improving the business/investment environment. Moreover, it provided lessons to the central level on local implementation of development plans. Hence, it fed into NDS/PRS dialogue, in which other donors participate. Moreover, O2 enhanced the capacity of a number of districts to engage with other donors.
<p><i>(iv) Is the logic for Output 2 coherent and realistic?</i></p> <p><i>Does the output link to the intended outcome, which is in turn linked to a broader impact or development objective?</i></p> <p><i>Are they based on a plausible causal analysis?</i></p> <p><i>Do the components of the output link logically to the planned objectives of the output, to the other outputs of the project, and the overall objective of the RGP project?</i></p>	<p>Yes, coherent logic, but logframe was not sufficiently detailed to provide real guidance to implementation and the indicators did not capture real impact.</p> <p>O2 linked and contributed to the intended outcome and impact. Changes at impact level are difficult to (fully) attribute to O2. Indicator 3 for the outcome captures to some extent O2's contribution to the outcome.</p> <p>The logic was plausible, although the outcome is ambitious.</p> <p>The three components/legs of O2 were well and logically linked to each other, and contributed to the RGP objective. However, while the various outputs logically contributed to the overall RGP objective, the links between O2 and the other outputs was not sufficiently strong (different target stakeholders, and different implementing partners) to justify having them combined in a single programme.</p>
<i>(v) Who are the partners and how strategic are they in terms of mandate, influence and capacity?</i>	The key partners for O2 implementation were the local government (rayons, oblast, jamoats) and to a large extent also mahallas. For a local governance output, this is logical. O2 helped building their capacities to fulfil their new mandates vis-à-vis the ongoing decentralisation process. Other stakeholders (communities, private sector, local NGOs) were also involved to ensure local influence, participation and ownership of the planning process.
<p><i>(vi) On which risks and assumptions does the output logic build?</i></p> <p><i>How realistic are they?</i></p>	Generally realistic risks and assumptions, a number of which have proven valid. However, some of the risks are in reality assumptions, and some have proven irrelevant (i.e. those related to JRCS). See Annex 8 and 9 for details.
<i>(vii) How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the progress towards achieving the output?</i>	Indicators in revised logframe (2012) are output oriented. They capture the existence of DPs, but not their quality or actual implementation and impact. They capture the number of sub-projects and BEE initiatives, but not their relevance, quality or impact. Monitoring of sub-project implementation was confined to TF funded sub-projects, and not covering



<i>Are they gender sensitive?</i>	<p>other DP priority projects implemented. 3-4 output oriented indicators are insufficient to capture the results of O2, which had the complexity of a project.</p> <p>The logframe indicators were not gender disaggregated. However, other gender-disaggregated indicators were monitored (e.g. in relation to number of beneficiaries reached, jobs created, representation in WGs).</p>
<b>II. Project effectiveness and efficiency</b>	
<i>(i) Has the project output achieved its planned objectives?</i>	<p>DP targets were met, TF targets were exceeded, and BEE targets were met.</p> <p>The output was generally achieved (although some thematic areas still need strengthening): <i>Improved capacities of local governance actors (particularly at rayon and Jamoat levels) for local development planning emphasising rural economic growth, for plans implementation and monitoring in line with NDS and PRS</i></p>
<i>(ii) Has the quantity and quality of the activities been satisfactory, and do the benefits accrue equally to men and women?</i>	<p>Large number and broad range of activities were implemented, the quality generally appears good. In some TF sub-projects the short time frame available seems to have impacted on the quality.</p> <p>Gender was factored into implementation in relation to TF criteria and migration. Gender is also mainstreaming into the DP methodology, but only two of the 14 DDPs actually include gender as a strategic priority. The other DDPs mostly mention women in relation to health, but not in relation to other spheres of life such as jobs, income and education.</p> <p>Some income generating sub-projects specifically targeted women (sewing centres, bakeries), 12 women initiatives were supported by the second TF round. It is not possible for the evaluation team to assess whether benefits of O2 accrue equally to both sexes, but UNDP estimates that 67.5% of the jobs created under the first TF round were for women.</p>
<i>(iii) Are the project partners using the results of the output activity?</i>	<p>Many DPs display a significant degree of implementation, TF funded sub-projects led to tangible changes for direct beneficiaries (generally at small to medium scale), BEE activities still early days, but have lead to participation of private sector in pilot PPD platforms.</p>
<i>(iv) How have the stakeholders been involved in Output implementation?</i>	<p>Local government stakeholders played a leading role in implementation, high level of community/ beneficiary contributions to sub-projects, but private sector involvement was more significant in some districts than others.</p>
<i>How effective has the project</i>	<p>Strong government ownership (MEDT and local</p>

<i>been in establishing national ownership for Output 2?</i>	government) of DP process and TF, strong community ownership of sub-projects and seemingly also of VDPs. Private sector ownership appears more mixed.
<i>(v) Has the project been responsive to the needs of national partners and changing partner priorities in implementation of Output 2?</i>	Yes, the O2 supported the roll-out of MEDP's DP guidelines. It helped local government and stakeholders to identify and implement their priorities.
<i>(vi) Has the project been responsive to any changes in the local context?</i>	The evaluation team has not come across significant local changes that required responses from O2, other than the need to cancel intended oblast level TF sub-projects and spending the funds on district sub-projects.
<i>(vii) In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements?</i>  <i>Why is this, and what have been the supporting factors?</i>  <i>How can these be built on?</i>	<p>O2 mobilised local stakeholders and engaged them in development planning and in sub-project implementation. It enhanced the ability of local governments to plan, implement, and to attract funding in a more inclusive way. First steps were made towards an improved BEE and enhanced PPD.</p> <p>Supporting factors: government decentralisation process, empowerment of local stakeholders, national level BEE reforms.</p> <p>With the mobilisation and commitment of local stakeholders (government, communities, civil society and private sector), there is scope to further improve the planning and implementation process and quality. Results inform national government about opportunities, and thereby create scope for national upscaling (UNDP is already replicating methodology in Khatlon).</p>
<i>(viii) In which areas does the project have least achievements?</i>  <i>What have been the constraining factors?</i>	<p>Planning and budgeting processes are still separate, but fiscal and budget reforms are ongoing. Still shortcomings in the conceptual understanding of environment and how to address environmental issues. Tendency to focus on hard infrastructure and less on soft issues, e.g. in relation to creating BEE. Private sector involvement in DP process could be further enhanced. M&amp;E capacity still not sufficient to ensure that sub-projects are environmentally sustainable, and to fully ensure quality of investments (dependency on UNDP for monitoring and quality assurance).</p> <p>Legislation on budgeting processes. Limited time and rushed implementation of TF sub-projects. Difficulties in balancing social needs and BEE needs, partly related to shortcomings in RGP logic and connection between outputs – and seemingly differing opinions among stakeholders on this. De-facto centralised tariff setting.</p>

<i>(ix) How effective have the innovative approaches introduced under Output 2 been in promoting a more fertile relationship between public and private sectors and to contributing to local development?</i>	O2 was quite effective in this, although private sector mobilisation was generally not quite as strong as community mobilisation. Private sector has participated in DP WGs and provided financial contributions for TF sub-projects. The presence and nature of private sector, and hence the potential, differs significantly among districts. The new PPD platforms are still to prove their effectiveness and ability to achieve tangible changes. The introduction of new websites with e-governance elements has improved the access to information and could facilitate the dialogue with local authorities.
<b>III. Efficiency of Resource Use and Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.</b>	
<i>(i) Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise) been allocated strategically to achieve the project output?</i>	It is the impression of the evaluation team that resources were allocated quite strategically to achieve O2. The TF was, compared to its relatively modest size, able to generate significant attention and ownership.
<i>(ii) Were resources used efficiently?</i>  <i>Were activities supporting achievement of the Output cost-effective?</i>  <i>Did the results achieved justify the costs?</i>	<p>The evaluation team has not come across significant inefficiencies in resource use. However, UNDP was been quite hands-on and allocated significant staff-time resources, e.g. to monitoring of TF sub-projects – perhaps some of this time would have been better spent on building the government capacity to carry out good monitoring in general, not just TF sub-projects.</p> <p>UNDP has calculated good rates of returns on the investments in DP processes and TF sub-projects (the evaluation team has not been in a position to assess the premises of the calculations).</p>
<i>(iii) Were project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?</i>	Generally yes, but TF implementation was significantly delayed due to challenges in reconciling government and UNDP procedures and rules. It would have been beneficial if district PPD had been initiated earlier than 2012 so lessons could have been generated and the coverage upscaled to more than just 3 districts. UNDP plans to continue supporting the PPD process after RGP.
<i>(iv) Were management capacities adequate to facilitate good results and efficient delivery?</i>	UNDP has a strong presence with two area offices covering Sughd Province. This enabled frequent contact with local stakeholders, and a strong capacity to monitor and follow-up on implementation.
<i>(v) Did the output receive adequate support from its national and regional partners?</i>	No major shortcomings found other than what can be expected with current capacity and financing constraints. Oblast government was very supportive of O2, especially TF. MEDT provided inputs/comments to DDPs. MEDT also provided consultant support, but this was based on project funding.
<i>(vi) How effectively did project management monitor</i>	See above on indicator shortcomings. Monitoring has mainly been output oriented, and less oriented

<p><i>output performance and results?</i></p> <p><i>Was relevant information and data systematically collected?</i></p>	<p>towards capturing outcomes and impact. UNDP has carried out a number of calculations on rates of return and number of beneficiaries reached, but the evaluation team did not have the opportunity to review the monitoring data collection and analysis.</p>
<p><i>(vii) Did the Output 2 make strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other UNDP projects and donors in the countries to increase its effectiveness and impact?</i></p>	<p>Generally well coordinated with other UNDP projects (e.g. ZVI, PEI, Khatlon, work on national development indicators); however, more collaboration with UNDP policy initiative on WATSAN tariff setting (TajWSS) could have benefited sub-projects. Coordination with GIZ, but somewhat limited scope for this due to differences in national implementing partners. Exchange of information and coordination took place with IFC (on BEE issues), USAID (on local governance and establishing local level entities), and Open Society Institute-Soros Foundation (on E-Governance).</p>
<p><i>(viii) To what extent was the support provided by the UNDP CP adequate and appropriate?</i></p> <p><i>What are the advantages/ disadvantages regarding effectiveness of delivery of using the CP umbrella programme?</i></p>	<p>The support was generally appropriate, although very hands-on in relation to the design and monitoring of sub-projects.</p> <p>No disadvantages identified. Advantages included using some of the same UNDP infrastructure and staff and building on experiences from other projects under CP.</p>
<p><b>IV. Impact and Sustainability</b></p>	
<p><i>(i) How far has the Output 2 made a significant contribution to broader and longer term development impact?</i></p> <p><i>What are the realistic long term effects of the project?</i></p>	<p>Impact definition in RGP logframe: <i>More inclusive economic development in rural areas of Tajikistan in support of the Government's National Development Strategy (NDS) and the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS)</i></p> <p>RGP Outcome: <i>Local environment for income generation and employment creation in Sughd Oblast, including for women and poor enhanced</i></p> <p>O2 contributed significantly to enabling the local level implementation of NDS and PRS, and enabled a more inclusive and participatory approach to development planning. However, while the evaluation team believes that O2 has contributed to a) an improved environment in Sughd for income generation and employment, and b) ensuring more inclusive economic development in rural Tajikistan - it is difficult to verify/attribute/measure the extent to which O2 has contributed to this as many other factors also influence this.</p> <p>Improved and more inclusive local development planning, and enhanced ability to attract funding from multiple sources to implement identified priorities.</p>

	Improved dialogue between local government and communities and private sector.
<i>(ii) Can the Output 2 activities be scaled up?</i>	Yes, are already being replicated by UNDP in Khatlon. All three O2 components (DP, TF, PPD) can be adapted and scaled up to national coverage.
<i>(iii) What was the impact of TF implementation to the beneficiaries?</i>	<p>Direct beneficiaries of TF sub-projects experienced different impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- jobs created at small scale for women (e.g. sewing centres, bakeries) and men (e.g. waste collection)</li> <li>- enhanced agricultural production and incomes, and new opportunities (e.g. irrigation, green houses, yaks)</li> <li>- better access to markets and services (e.g. bridges)</li> <li>- improved access to clean water and reduced exposure to water-borne diseases (domestic water supply)</li> <li>- cleaner environment (e.g. waste management)</li> </ul>
<i>(iv) Can the TF mechanism be scaled up?</i>	<p>In principle, the TF can be significantly upscaled, both in terms of larger geographical coverage and increased funding for individual oblasts and rayons. In the case of the latter, care should be taken to a) ensure that local government contributions can sufficiently match TF resources to ensure ownership, and b) to avoid construction/rehabilitating infrastructure beyond the local O&amp;M capacity.</p>
<p><i>(v) Can the Output 2 gradually be handed over to national (regional) partners, and will they be able to continue the activities and take them forward?</i></p> <p><i>Are national/ regional/ district partners willing and able to continue with the activities?</i></p>	<p>Yes, O2 could, and should, be gradually handed over to government partners. However, further support is needed, especially in some areas (see above) before they can fully assume responsibility. A plan for hand-over/sustainability is needed from the onset of any follow-up programming for RGP O2.</p> <p>There is a clear willingness of government at all levels to continue the process – and in principle an acceptance of gradually assuming full responsibility, including full funding responsibility.</p>
<i>(vi) To what extent were links to longer term national reforms articulated, propagated and achieved?</i>	<p>O2 results are being fed back to MEDT to inform their planning methodology, and results of the business perception surveys provided information on the implementation of reforms. PPD's are hoped to convey private sector concerns to the national level, e.g. on the new tax law. More emphasis should in the future be put on this aspect, e.g. in relation to addressing bottlenecks related to a) linking planning and budgeting processes, b) local control of revenue collection and spending, and c) tariff setting.</p>

## Annex 8: Assessment of status of risks from Prodoc

O2 Block	Risks	Evaluation findings
2.1 Government's planning and monitoring capacities (UNDP and GTZ) (DDPs, ODP)	<p>By 2012 jamoats will still have limited competencies and budgeting for supporting local development process</p> <p>Deficit of qualified human resources at district and jamoat level will hinder capacity development efforts</p>	<p>Competencies vary. Still jamoats do not have own budgets.</p> <p>Capacity development generally been successful, but still needs for capacity building in some areas (e.g. on M&amp;E, environment, formulating "soft" and BEE projects)</p>
2.2 Private sector and civil society participation (UNDP, GTZ, sub-contractors) (incl. JDPs, VDPs)	<p>Commitment of regional, district and sub-district to introduction of the new approach to development planning and budgeting is a precondition for their participation in the Program.</p> <p>Individual power interests of the current leaders of kishlak committees will hinder the process of their transformation</p> <p>JRCs will have weak ability to mobilise resources and will fail to secure their sustainability on a long-run.</p> <p>Vested interests prevent the evolution of JRCs</p> <p>Resources that are a subject of decision making of local governments remain limited and it be difficult to stimulate private sector and civil society participation</p>	<p>An assumption rather than a risk. Government has demonstrated commitment to O2 at all levels.</p> <p>Evaluation team has not come across problems of such kind, but do not know whether this has been a problem in some areas</p> <p>JRCs appear not to have played a significant role in RGP O2</p> <p>Not relevant</p> <p>Local government's financial resources remain limited and mostly allocated for salaries and maintenance</p>
2.3 Support infrastructure and government's transactional services (UNDP and GIZ) (TF and BEE)	<p>Inflexible approach of some donors will hinder their ability to contribute resources to the Trust Fund</p> <p>Budgeting practices are not changed towards program performance budgeting and the Trust Fund remains a tool for mobilisation of mainly external funds mobilization</p> <p>The current level of international assistance provided to the oblast does not drop dramatically and other donors are encouraged to contribute to the trust fund</p> <p>Local governments will still have limited mandates and functions in the coming years in support of economic activities</p>	<p>UNDP/DFID (and UNEP through PEI) remain the only donors to TF</p> <p>An assumption rather than a risk. Budgeting and planning processes remains not linked. But districts have been able to raise funding for DDP implementation from other sources than TF.</p> <p>An assumption rather than a risk. International assistance appears not to have changed significantly, but TF has not attracted other donors.</p> <p>Mandate of local governments appears not to be a major issue. Capacity and funding remaining limiting factors.</p>
2.4 Local gov't	None	

reform (UNDP)		
---------------	--	--

## Annex 9: Assessment of status of assumptions from Prodoc

O2 Indicator		Assumptions	Evaluation findings
Prodoc	2012 Logframe		
a) Volume of funds utilized by the district and sub-district governments for the implementation of their DPs from: Nat. public budget (incl. MTEF); own budget and revenues; non-budgetary funds (incl. voluntary funds from private sector and SCOs); international sources	Number of Development Plans (DPs) elaborated based on the new planning methodology with enhanced focus on economic development at the oblast, district and Jamoat levels	Regional, district and sub-district authorities are delegated broader authority for local revenues collection and their discretionary usage	Local governments' authority in revenue collection and use has not changed yet.
b) System for monitoring economic development performance of district and sub-district DPs is in place	Number of DP economic subprojects implemented and systematically monitored and evaluated at the district and Jamoat levels	District and sub-district authorities are able to fund initiatives aiming at economic development	Districts' funding capacity remains limited, but they have been able to allocate some funding for DDP implementation. Jamoats have no funds.
c) Availability and diversity of participatory mechanisms of decision-making and development plans monitoring and budgeting at regional, district and jamoat level		<p>Civic liberties in Tajikistan are not restricted and remain at least at the current level.</p> <p>Other donors/NGO financing does not undermine reform of local government</p>	<p>No changes identified.</p> <p>No issues identified in relation to disruptive donor financing.</p>
d) Number of rayons and jamoats implementing existing provisions with regards to enhancing business environment	Number of initiatives implemented at the local level to enhance business environment	<p>Government economic initiatives and investment in Sughd Oblast are carried out as planned</p> <p>Government policies being implemented at the local level lead to improved business environment</p>	<p>No issues identified in relation to disruptions of government plans.</p> <p>No data/studies available to evaluation team to assess the extent to which policies have improved the business environment.</p>

## Annex 10: OECD/DAC and UNDP definitions of evaluation criteria

### OECD/DAC and UNDP criterion definition:

Relevance:	<p>OECD/DAC: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.</p> <p>UNDP: Relevance concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues. Relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. It also incorporates the concept of responsiveness—that is, the extent to which UNDP was able to respond to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner.</p>
Effectiveness:	<p>OECD/DAC: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.</p> <p>UNDP: Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the initiative's intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved.</p>
Efficiency:	<p>OECD/DAC: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.</p> <p>UNDP: Efficiency measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Efficiency is important in ensuring that resources have been used appropriately and in highlighting more effective uses of resources.</p>
Impact:	<p>OECD/DAC: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended</p> <p>UNDP: Impact measures changes in human development and people's well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Many development organizations evaluate impact because it generates useful information for decision making and supports accountability for delivering results. At times, evaluating impact faces challenges: Confirming whether benefits to beneficiaries can be directly attributed to UNDP support can be difficult, especially when UNDP is one</p>



of many contributors. However, the impact of UNDP initiatives should be assessed whenever their direct benefits on people are discernible.

Sustainability: OECD/DAC: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

UNDP: Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future.

Sources:

- 1) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/2754804.pdf>)
- 2) UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results

## Annex 11: Output 2 logframe (May 2012 revision)

OUTPUT 2	Output Indicator 2.1		Baseline – Dec 09	Milestone 1 – June 2011	Milestone 2 – June 2012	Target (December 2012)	Assumptions
Improved capacities of local governance actors (particularly at district and Jamoat levels) for local economic development planning, implementation and monitoring	Number of Development Plans (DPs) elaborated based on the new planning methodology with enhanced focus on economic development at the oblast, district and Jamoat levels	Planned	7 District Development Plans (DDPs) exist developed on the old methodology. No Jamoat DPs (JDPs).	14 DDP and 65 JDPs developed on new methodology	Oblast development plan is updated	14 DDPs, 65 JDPs developed on new methodology and regional development plan is updated	Regional, district and sub-district authorities are delegated broader authority for local revenues collection and their discretionary usage.
		Achieved					District and sub-district authorities are able to fund initiatives aiming at economic development.
		Source					
		Oblast, District and Jamoat authorities					
	Number of DP economic subprojects implemented and systematically monitored and evaluated at the district and Jamoat levels		Baseline – Dec 09	Milestone 1 – June 2011	Milestone 2 – June 2012	Target (December 2012)	Civic liberties in Tajikistan are not restricted and remain at least at the current level.
		Planned	No economic subprojects from DDPs implemented, monitored and evaluated.	At least 28 economic subprojects from DPs are identified	At least 14 subprojects related to Local Economic Development (LED) from 14 DDPs are implemented, monitored and evaluated	At least 21 economic sub-projects in total, from 14 DDPs, are implemented, monitored and evaluated	Other donors/NGO financing does not undermine reform of local government
		Achieved					Government economic initiatives and investment in Sughd Oblast are carried out as planned
		Source					
		Oblast, District and Jamoat authorities; Annual DDP reviews					Government policies being implemented at the local level lead to

IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)	Output Indicator 2.3		Baseline – Dec 09	Milestone 1 – June 2011	Milestone 2 – June 2012	Target (December 2012)	
25%	Number of initiatives implemented at the local level to enhance business environment	Planned	no initiatives implemented	0	2 initiatives implemented at the local level to enhance business environment	4 initiatives implemented at the local level to enhance business environment	
		Achieved					
		Source					RISK RATING
		Oblast, District and Jamoat authorities; Annual DDP reviews					Low
INPUTS (USD)	DFID (USD)		GIZ(USD)	UNDP (USD)	Total (USD)	DFID SHARE (%)	
	\$2,820,000.00		\$187,212.00	\$1,605,282.00	\$4,612,494.00	61	
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)						

## Annex 12: Financial report on O2 expenditures (January 2010 – March 2013)

Overall RGP Budget for O2	DFID			UNDP			Total as of 31 March 2013		
	Budget allocated	Expenditure	Balance	Budget allocated	Expenditure	Balance	Budget allocated	Expenditure	Balance
<b>Improved capacities of local governance actors (particularly at rayon and Jamoat levels) for local development planning emphasising rural economic growth, for plans implementation and monitoring in line with NDS and PRS</b>									
<b>2.1 Programme:</b>									
<i>Technical Advisor - Local Governance Component</i>	130,455	130,655	-200	100,000	87,197	12,803	230,455	217,852	12,603
<i>Capacity building of civil servants in economic development and management issues (ICST)</i>	80,000	33,039	46,961	-	50,000	-50,000	80,000	83,039	-3,039
<i>Support to formulation of DDPs (8 districts) and updating of existing DDPs (6 districts)</i>	154,000	155,215	-1,215	200,000	198,588	1,412	354,000	353,803	197.23
<i>Support to formulation of jamoat development plans</i>	50,000	31,155	18,845	50,000	56,096	-6,096	100,000	87,251	12,749.21
<i>Review of the oblast development plan</i>	40,000	39,867	133	-	60	-60	40,000	39,927	73
<i>Mahalla level capacity building (6 districts)</i>	105,000	104,560	440	100,000	100,000	-	205,000	204,560	440
<i>Promoting safe labour migration (IOM contract)</i>	300,000	472,904	-172,904	300,000	-	300,000	600,000	472,904	127,096
<i>Enhancing data management at district level (State Statistics Committee)</i>	150,000	96,326	53,674	-	47,877	-47,877	150,000	144,203	5,797
<i>Enhancement of economic budgeting processes at the district level (MoF)</i>	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	-
<i>Support to annual review of DDPs and JDPs in 14 districts</i>	50,000	31,185	18,815	25,000	21,117	3,883	75,000	52,302	22,697.53
<i>Consultancy - development</i>	-	13,367	-13,367	75,000	33,293	41,707	75,000	46,659	28,341

<i>planning issues</i>									
<i>Consultancy - economic development budgeting</i>	-	48,650	-48,650	70,000	21,350	48,650	70,000	70,000	-
<i>Training to key rayon rayon dpts related to stimulation of economic development</i>		25,645	-25,645	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	75,645	-25,645
<i>Training to local civil society and private sector on participation in economic development planning and monitoring</i>		9342	-9,342	40,000	19,591	20,409	40,000	28,933	11,067
<i>Experience exchange / coordination workshops for rayon and jamoat WGs</i>		9,671	-9,671	40,000	5,069	34,931	40,000	14,740	25,260
<i>Experience dessimination, publications</i>	32,500	35,592	-3,092	-	13,560	-13,560	32,500	49,152	-16,652
<i>Capacity development of UNDP AO governance advisors</i>		8,948	-8,948	50,000	26,096	23,904	50,000	35,044	14,956
<i>Establishment of Trust Funds to support implementation of DDPs (150K per district)</i>	1,600,000	1,600,000	-	500,000	500,000	-	2,100,000	2,100,000	-
<i>Monitor of and provide technical support to the implementation of the projects approved under the Trust Fund 2nd cycle</i>	131,455	7,553	123,902	-	-	-	131,455	7,553	123,902
<i>Evaluate implemented projects under the TF</i>	14,982	-	14,982	-	-	-	14,982	-	14,982
<i>Support further capacity building of districts in M&amp;E of DDPs and conduct implementation progress review of DDPs</i>	30,000	24,990	5,010	-	-	-	30,000	24,990	5,010
<i>Conduct final external evaluation of RGP</i>	30,000	-	30,000	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000
<i>Prepare lessons learnt report for RGP by external consultants</i>	10,000	-	10,000	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
<i>Publish Lessons Learnt Report</i>	15,000	-	15,000	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000

<i>and disseminate outcomes of RGP at the regional and national levels</i>									
<i>Projects strategic support and oversight</i>	10,000	4,576	5,424	-	-	-	10,000	4,576	5,424
<i>Programme staff cost</i>	-	174,182	174,182	-	70,779	-70,779	-	244,961	-244,961
<b>Total for O2:</b>	<b>2,983,392</b>	<b>3,107,423</b>	<b>124,031</b>	<b>1,600,000</b>	<b>1,300,672</b>	<b>299,328</b>	<b>4,583,392</b>	<b>4,408,094</b>	<b>175,298</b>

### Annex 13: Overview of Trust Fund contributions

№	districts	TF round 1 (USD)				
		UNDP+PEI	investment from oblast	contributions of rayo	social contributions	total
1	Shahristan	50,000	5,000	0	6,469	61,469
2	Istaravshan	50,000	5,022	75,916	45,571	176,509
3	Spitamen	50,000	5,000	0	11,588	66,588
4	Zafarabod	61,554	6,155	0	70,867	138,576
5	Kanibadam	56,326.68	5,632.56	0	60,030.46	121,989.70
6	Gonchi	63,635	6,375	0	151,939	221,949
7	Panjakent	50,000	10,000	5,000	28,193	93,193
8	B.Gafurov	50,000	5,000	0	79,028	134,028
9	Asht	50,000	5,000	0	11,588	66,588
10	Maschok	50,000	5,000	0	101,500	156,500
11	Isfara	50,000	5,000	1,050	3,741	59,791
12	Ayni	50,000	5,000	2,521	6,224.00	63,745
13	D.Rasulov	60,678	6,110	0	31,334	98,122
14	Kohistoni Maschok	57,654	5,765	2,883	26,168	92,470
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>749,848</b>	<b>80,060</b>	<b>87,370</b>	<b>634,240</b>	<b>1,551,518</b>

№	District	TF round 2 (USD)				
		UNDP	Investment from oblast	Contributions from rayons	Social contributions	Total
1	Shahristan	88,519	8,852	0	1,706	99,077
2	Istaravshan	88,520	8,852	19,180	48,407	164,959
3	Spitamen	118,460	11,840	13,650	0	143,950
4	Zafarabod	88,520	8,852	0	248,189	345,561
5	Kanibadam	135,060	13,506	0	34,444.35	183,010
6	Gonchi	88,520	8,852	0	80,852	178,224
7	Panjakent	135,060	13,506	13,506	14,040	176,112
8	B.Gafurov	88,520	8,852	0	123,789	221,161
9	Asht	135,060	13,506	0	14,478.45	163,044
10	Maschok	88,520	8,852	0	99,435	196,807
11	Isfara	105,060	10,506	0	10,641	126,207
12	Ayni	16,600	1,660	0	3,062	21,322
13	D.Rasulov	88,520	8,852	4,176	49,494	151,042
14	Kohistoni Maschok	135,060	13,506	0	41,138	189,704
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,399,999</b>	<b>139,994</b>	<b>50,512</b>	<b>769,676</b>	<b>2,360,181</b>



		TF round 1+2 (USD)				
№	District	UNDP	Investment from oblast	Contributions from rayons	Social contributions	Total
1	Shahristan	138,519	13,852	0	8,175	160,546
2	Istaravshan	138,520	13,874	95,096	93,978	341,468
3	Spitamen	168,460	16,840	13,650	11,588	210,538
4	Zafarabod	150,074	15,007	0	319,056	484,137
5	Kanibadam	191,387	19,139	0	94,475	305,000
6	Gonchi	152,155	15,227	0	232,791	400,173
7	Panjakent	185,060	23,506	18,506	42,233	269,305
8	B.Gafurov	138,520	13,852	0	202,817	355,189
9	Asht	185,060	18,506	0	26,066	229,632
10	Maschok	138,520	13,852	0	200,935	353,307
11	Isfara	155,060	15,506	1,050	14,382	185,998
12	Ayni	66,600	6,660	2,521	9,286	85,067
13	D.Rasulov	149,198	14,962	4,176	80,828	249,164
14	Kohistoni Maschok	192,714	19,271	2,883	67,306	282,174
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,149,847</b>	<b>220,054</b>	<b>137,882</b>	<b>1,403,916</b>	<b>3,911,699</b>

№	District	TF round 1+2 (%)				
		UNDP	Investment from oblast	Contributions from rayons	Social contributions	Total
1	Shahristan	86	9	0	5	100
2	Istaravshan	41	4	28	28	100
3	Spitamen	80	8	6	6	100
4	Zafarabod	31	3	0	66	100
5	Kanibadam	63	6	0	31	100
6	Gonchi	38	4	0	58	100
7	Panjakent	69	9	7	16	100
8	B.Gafurov	39	4	0	57	100
9	Asht	81	8	0	11	100
10	Maschok	39	4	0	57	100
11	Isfara	83	8	1	8	100
12	Ayni	78	8	3	11	100
13	D.Rasulov	60	6	2	32	100
14	Kohistoni Maschok	68	7	1	24	100
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100</b>

## Annex 14: DDP implementation status per 1 April 2013

Districts	DDP budget (‘000 TJS)	Funding secured (‘000 TJS)	Impl status	Financial sources													
				Districts		Oblast		Central gov		Enterprises		Communities & entrepreneurs		Foreign direct investments		Int'l donors	
				‘000 TJS	%	‘000 TJS	%	‘000 TJS	%	‘000 TJS	%	‘000 TJS	%	‘000 TJS	%	‘000 TJS	%
Spitamen	225,416	53,114	24%	3,542	6.7	1,340	2.5	620	1.2		0.0	41,768	78.6	5,566	10.5	278	0.5
B.Gafurov	158,614	109,356	69%	4,653	4.3	14,586	13.3	861	0.8	10,446	9.6	59,769	54.7	11,546	10.6	7,495	6.9
Istaravshan	293,968	123,845	42%	2,207	1.8	684	0.6	5,509	4.4	1,682	1.4	110,126	88.9	2,159	1.7	1,479	1.2
Asht	375,514	83,279	22%	2,150	2.6	590	0.7	5,410	6.5	4,126	5.0	38,874	46.7	31,835	38.2	295	0.4
Ayni	107,018	40,810	38%	408	1.0	4,578	11.2	8,162	20.0		0.0	19,997	49.0	6,854	16.8	811	2.0
K. Maschok	189,088	22,475	12%	405	1.8	921	4.1	5,821	25.9	551	2.5	2,899	12.9	8,122	36.1	3,756	16.7
Panjakent	1,818,835	1158,316	64%	4,062	0.4	1,550	0.1	9,776	0.8	6,346	0.5	1,384	0.1	1,129,752	97.5	5,446	0.5
Shahriston	50,646	23,463	46%	414	1.8	939	4.0	469	2.0	7,912	33.7	10,144	43.2	2,761	11.8	824	3.5
Zafarobod	86,099	31,870	37%	80	0.3	233	0.7	1,041	3.3	291	0.9	25,779	80.9	4,251	13.3	195	0.6
J.Rasulov	280,759	39,295	14%	58	0.1	30,712	78.2	1,190	3.0	636	1.6	5,479	13.9	644	1.6	576	1.5
Maschok	93,697	26,853	29%	269	1.0	412	1.5	8,100	30.2	9,103	33.9	6,744	25.1	1,478	5.5	749	2.8
Gonchi	68,519	25,747	38%	2,464	9.6	1,054	4.1	543	2.1	271	1.1	16,672	64.8	4,619	17.9	124	0.5
Kanibadam	91,229	53,015	58%	720	1.4	103	0.2	220	0.4	3,743	7.1	11,412	21.5	28,688	54.1	8,129	15.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,839,401</b>	<b>1791,437</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>21,431</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>57,703</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>47,722</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>45,106</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>351,047</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>1,238,273</b>	<b>69.1</b>	<b>30,156</b>	<b>1.7</b>

Districts*	DDP budget (‘000 TJS)	Funding secured (‘000 TJS)	Implementatio n status %	No. of projects in DDP	No. of completed projects	No. of ongoing projects	No. of unfinanced projects
Spitamen	225,416.30	53,113.80	24%	102	44	11	47
B.Gafurov	158,614.00	109,355.80	69%	216	100	42	74
Istaravshan	293,968.00	123,845.00	42%	123	34	20	71
Asht	375,513.80	83,279.30	22%	184	17	5	162
Ayni	107,017.90	40,809.50	38%	180	35	48	97
K. Maschok	189,087.50	22,474.92	12%	126	11	16	98
Panjakent	1,818,834.90	1,158,316.10	64%	249	38	89	125
Shahriston	50,645.60	23,462.50	46%	117	24	32	70
Zafarabad	86,099.20	31,869.50	37%	125	32	20	73
J.Rasulov	280,759.20	39,294.50	14%	85	27	5	53
Maschok	93,697.00	26,853.40	29%	190	36	27	127
Gonchi	68,519.40	25,747.40	38%	136	53	11	61
Kanibadam	91,228.60	53,015.00	58%	242	110	62	68
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,839,401.40</b>	<b>1,791,436.72</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>2075</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>1126</b>

\* No data is available for Isfara district

## Annex 15: District economic indicators 2010-2012

Districts*	Number of new jobs created			Produced goods in industry ('000 TJS)			Produced goods in agriculture ('000 TJS)		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Spitamen	2487	2567	2612	51,869.00	74,038.00	97,720.00	276,416.00	308,900.00	356,200.00
B.Gafurov	5086	3422	3757	103,242.00	121,511.00	189,500.00	331,083.00	374,091.00	464,700.00
Istaravshan	3450	3775	3504	88,668.00	103,087.00	159,460.00	290,413.00	294,813.00	284,620.00
Asht	750	894	722	28,217.30	39,680.50	50,260.00	242,310.00	250,298.00	162,700.00
Ayni	1144	1045	1046	63,100.00	119,600.00	117,800.00	74,800.00	78,400.00	95,091.00
Kohistoni Maschok	411	390	322	20,000.00	20,000.00	389,100.00	99,700.00	105,300.00	126,300.00
Panjakent	1535	1535	2052	258,000.00	357,100.00	440,200.00	283,200.00	591,200.00	675,300.00
Shahriston	427	468	509	2,466.70	4,745.90	57,304.00	90,300.00	110,700.00	118,100.00
Zafarabad	1219	1221	837	98,700.00	102,900.00	92,805.00	132,500.00	155,000.00	197,400.00
J.Rasulov	954	998	1738	74,300.00	98,941.00	9,1600.00	253,180.00	253,867.00	253,600.00
Maschok	1487	1507	1475	77,289.30	144,200.00	18,3632.10	250,209.00	269,119.00	293,824.00
Gonchi	572	635	551	5,111.80	8,331.90	8,500.00	240,994.00	225,112.00	267,500.00
Kanibadam	3002	3022	3017	93,143.00	111,153.40	121,800.00	165,500.00	246,877.00	314,500.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>20491</b>	<b>21438</b>	<b>22142</b>	<b>1,036,816.00</b>	<b>1,394,535.00</b>	<b>1,756,491.00</b>	<b>2,613,707.00</b>	<b>3,181,489.00</b>	<b>3,509,735.00</b>

\* No data is available for Isfara district