



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **FOR**

### **MID-TERM REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE UNDP/GEF PROJECT:**

### **PIMS 3674 - “SUPPORT TO SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT IN DUSHANBE CITY”**

### **Contents**

1. INTRODUCTION .....	2
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	3
3. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW AND REVISION .....	4
4. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK.....	6
5. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE REVIEW AND REVISION .....	9
6. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE .....	11
7. SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	11
8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.....	12
9. APPLICATION PROCESS.....	14
Annex 1. Revised Logical Framework and Project Performance Indicators .....	16
Annex 2. Review and Revision Report: Sample Outline.....	23
Annex 3. Co-financing Table.....	25
Annex 4. Application of GEF minimum evaluation requirements. Rate tables. ....	26
Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators .....	30
Annex 6. Cost breakdown template .....	31
Annex 7. GEF terminology and project review criteria.....	32

<b>Project Title:</b>	“Support to Sustainable Transport Management in Dushanbe city”
<b>Functional Titles:</b>	Mid-term Review and Revision International Consultant
<b>Duty Station:</b>	Dushanbe, Tajikistan
<b>Duration:</b>	Estimated 20-25 working days in a period of 60 calendar days (including 5 working days in Dushanbe, Tajikistan)
<b>Contract Type:</b>	Individual Contract (IC)
<b>Terms of Payment:</b>	Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Mid-Term Report

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects supported by the GEF should undergo a mid-term evaluation upon completion of the first half of the Project’s term. The purpose of the mid-term review is to provide information about the status of the “Support to Sustainable Transport Management in Dushanbe city” project implementation in order to ensure accountability for the expenditures to date and the delivery of outputs and to make recommendations for improvements to the project, so that UNDP could make midcourse corrections to the project, as appropriate (**Mid-term Review and Revision**).

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
- iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

This review is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, available at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184>

and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, available at

[http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/gef/UNDP-GEF-Evaluation\\_Guidance\\_2011.doc](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/gef/UNDP-GEF-Evaluation_Guidance_2011.doc)

This Mid-Term Review is initiated by UNDP Country Office in Tajikistan and Bratislava Regional Centre as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project and it aims at providing managers (at the level of regulatory bodies of Dushanbe city Administration (Khukumat), the Ministry of Transport of the Republic of Tajikistan, UNDP and the GEF Secretariat) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the

project and with a strategy policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's outputs and outcomes. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **Summary:**

Since early 2000, Tajikistan's capital city, Dushanbe, has been experiencing rapid expansion in the use of private motor vehicles, alongside deterioration in public transport caused by rising personal incomes, growing migrant population, a liberal trade policy and a largely neglected public transport system. This has led to the significant increase in urban air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. It is estimated that 87 percent of the total air emissions in Dushanbe are associated with mobile sources.

The project aims at reducing local and GHG emissions while improving access and quality of public transport services for all residents. It is expected that by the end of the project the share of sustainable public transport modes will increase from current 8% to 28% leading to nearly 50% reduction in GHG emissions from city's transport sector.

To achieve these ambitious targets, the project will develop and help Dushanbe City Government implement an integrated policy framework that includes:

- a) Enhancing vehicle efficiency and setting appropriate fuel quality standards
- b) Improving the service quality of public transport, in particular trolleybuses
- c) Increasing opportunities for non-motorized modes such as walking and biking
- d) Developing integrated land-use/transport plans to reduce demand for travel
- e) Enhancing municipal institutional transformation and governance structure to embrace sustainable transport.

The UNDP/GEF project "Support to sustainable transport management in Dushanbe" was approved on 27 April 2009 by the GEF and the Project Document was signed on 13 of April 2010, which represents the official starting date of the project.

The inception phase began in July 2010 and included an inception workshop resulted in review and simplification of the entire set of performance indicators to measure project progress at the outcomes and objective levels. The reviewed project logical framework is presented in the Annex 1.

The key implementing partner is the Dushanbe city Administration (Khukumat) of the Republic of Tajikistan.

### **Project Objective and Outcomes:**

The UNDP/GEF project “Support to sustainable transport management in Dushanbe” is financed through the Global Environmental Facility. The project has a total budget of US \$1,170.00 with GEF financing of US \$970,000. The project duration is four years.

The overall objective of the project is to reduce local and greenhouse gas emissions associated with the transport system in Dushanbe while improving access for all residents. In close collaboration with the Khukumat of Dushanbe the integrated policy framework that includes several strategies serving to meet project objective will be developed through enhancing vehicle efficiency standards and setting appropriate fuel quality standards, improving the service quality of public transport, increasing opportunities for non-motorized modes such as walking and biking, developing integrated land-use/transport plans to reduce demand for travel and enhancing institutional frameworks to embrace sustainable transport.

The outcomes of the project shall be achieved through the implementation of five main activity groups and the subsequent delivery of expected results.

### **Project outcomes defined in the Project Document:**

1.	Lower emissions from vehicles in Dushanbe, with safety and health quality in mind
2.	Increased use of public transport, particularly trolleybuses
3.	Integrated land use and urban transport planning at the metropolitan level
4.	Increased use of non-motorised modes, including bicycles
5.	Institutional transformation of government, businesses and general public to embrace sustainable transport

Associated with these outcomes there are a number of Outputs (please see [Annex 1](#) for the Revised Logical Framework of the project). Progress towards them is reported in 2010-2011 Annual Project Implementation Review (to be available for the evaluation team).

## **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW AND REVISION**

The project review and revision is initiated and commissioned jointly by UNDP Tajikistan Country Office and by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit (Bratislava). Mid-term review and revision is intended to identify potential project design issues, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term review and revision provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The mid-term review and revision should be informative in nature seeking to take stock of what has been achieved by the project to date, and to improve implementation of the project during the remaining phase

of implementation. It should provide the stakeholders with knowledge, identification of best practices and lessons learned that could be transferred to other projects. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Project Board, partner institutions and the donor.

**The Mid-Term Review and Revision International Consultant will review, analyze and provide conclusions and recommendations on the following:**

- The relevance of the project and its objectives and expected outcomes in the prevailing (or changing) environment it is operating in
- The degree to which the project is on track to meet its objectives and outcomes as defined in the project document and request for CEO endorsement
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project's approach
- The efficiency of the project strategy in delivering outputs
- Adaptive Management: Assessment of external factors affecting the project, and the extent to which the project has been able to adapt and/or mitigate the effects of such factors in a pro-active manner and in order to adapt to changing circumstances and situations
- The approach to project management, including the role of stakeholders and coordination with other development projects in the same area
- The extent to which the target beneficiaries have benefited from the project activities
- The level of beneficiaries' and partners satisfaction with programme implementation and results
- The needs and potentials for a continuation or up-scaling of the initiative

**The Mid Term review and revision Report is expected to provide further advice on how to:**

1. Revise project strategy and logical framework in light of the changes in the external and internal environment happened since the project start;
2. Implement revised project strategy and ensure effective monitoring of project results;
3. Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
4. Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
5. Enhance organizational and development learning;
6. Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding.

**The revision should assess:**

#### Project concept and design

The Consultant will assess the project concept and design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

## Implementation

The revision will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the revision is to assess the Project team's use of adaptive management in project implementation starting from the inception workshop and in the earliest stages of the project.

## Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The revision will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the outcomes and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The revision should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The revision will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

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

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

## **4. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK**

The Mid-term Review and Revision will cover the following aspects:

### **1. Progress towards Results**

Changes in development conditions: Assess the way the project has contributed in supporting the business of the national partners in line with the project main objectives.

Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before (i.e., baseline) and after (up-to-date) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions within the project boundaries to conditions in similar unmanaged areas.

Project strategy: how and why outputs in the project document and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project boundaries, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainable financing strategy, design and implementation of novel financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the cross-cutting economic sectors, etc.

### **2. Project's Adaptive Management Framework**

#### **(a) Monitoring Systems**

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:

- Do they provide the necessary information?
- Do they involve key partners?
- Are they efficient?
- Are additional tools required?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary<sup>1</sup>. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise<sup>2</sup>;
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements<sup>3</sup>.
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tools and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.

(b) Risk Management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted;
- Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
  - Is the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied?
  - How can the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?

(c) Work Planning

- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
  - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content
  - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?
- Assess the use of routinely updated workplans;
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
- Are the work planning processes result-based<sup>4</sup>? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

(d) Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management;
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

### 3. **Underlying Factors**

- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors;

---

<sup>1</sup> See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm>

<sup>2</sup> See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at [http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/UNDP\\_PME\\_capacity\\_21.pdf](http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/UNDP_PME_capacity_21.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures", available at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184>

<sup>4</sup> RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

- Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made;
- Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

#### 4. UNDP Contribution

- Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
  - Field visits
  - Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
  - PIR preparation and follow-up
  - GEF guidance
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide<sup>5</sup>, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework;
- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

#### 5. Partnership Strategy

- Assess how partners are involved in the project's adaptive management framework:
  - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
  - Using already existing data and statistics
  - Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
- Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
- Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making; Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
- Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

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

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

- Documentation review (desk study) - the list of documentation to be reviewed will be made available to the Consultant along with the signing the Contract

The consultant should also provide **ratings** of Project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria. Aspects of the Project to be rated for its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency are:

1	Implementation approach;
2	Country ownership/drivers
3	Outcome/Achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved).

<sup>5</sup> The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>



4	Stakeholder participation/public involvement
5	Sustainability;
6	Replication approach;
7	Financial management and Cost-effectiveness;
8	Monitoring and evaluation

The following rating scale should be used for assessment of outcomes:

- a. **Highly satisfactory (HS).** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- b. **Satisfactory (S).** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- c. **Moderately satisfactory (MS).** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- d. **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- e. **Unsatisfactory (U).** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- f. **Highly unsatisfactory (HU).** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

The review is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”(see <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>) and UNDP/GEF Evaluation Guidance, available at [http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/gef/UNDP-GEF-Evaluation\\_Guidance\\_2011.doc](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/gef/UNDP-GEF-Evaluation_Guidance_2011.doc).

## 5. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE REVIEW AND REVISION

The key product expected from this mid-term review and revision is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- **Executive summary (2-3 pages)**
  - Brief description of the project
  - Context and purpose of the evaluation
  - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- **Introduction (3 pages max.)**
  - Project background
  - Purpose of the review and revision
  - Key issues addressed
  - Methodology of the review and revision
  - Structure of the review and revision
- **The Project and its development context (3 pages max.)**
  - Project start and its duration
  - Implementation status

- Problems that the project seek to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Main stakeholders
  - Results expected
- **An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy (3-5 pages)**
- **Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance) (10 pages max.)**
  - Project formulation
    - Implementation approach
    - Country ownership
    - Stakeholder participation
    - Replication approach
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
    - Management arrangements
  - Implementation
    - Financial planning
    - Monitoring and evaluation
    - Execution and implementation modalities
    - Management by the UNDP country office
    - Coordination and operation issues
    - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
  - Results
    - Attainment of objective
    - Prospects of sustainability
- **Conclusions and recommendations (20 pages)**
  - Corrective actions for the design, implementation and monitoring of the project, including:
    - Updated baseline data
    - Revised logical framework, including key outcomes and targets
    - Recommendation for revised project management and implementation structure and probable project period extension
    - TORs for key international and national consultants
  - Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Identification and suggestions for mitigation of potential and critical risks
  - Formal documents for project revision needed for the project extension
- **Lessons learned (3 pages max)**
  - Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

## 6. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

It is expected that review and revision will require an estimated input of 20-22 working days, to be completed within **a period of 60 calendar days** (which includes one 5-day mission to Dushanbe), with the following deliverables due:

Deliverables	Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Inception report including work plan and review and revision matrix prepared and accepted</li></ul>	10 calendar days from signing the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>5-Day Mission to Dushanbe</li></ul>	20 calendar days from signing of the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Draft Review and Revision Report on approximately 20 pages prepared and accepted</li></ul>	35 calendar days from signing the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Draft Review and Revision Report presented to the Project Team, Implementing Partner and beneficiaries, for feedback</li></ul>	40 calendar days from signing the contract
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Final Review and Revision Report (approx. 40–45 pages) with Executive Summary (3 pages max.) finalized and accepted by UNDP</li></ul>	55 calendar days from signing the contract.

All payments will be made upon delivery, quality assurance and prior approval of outputs by UNDP and as per schedule above.

## 7. SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS

### Skills and Competencies

- Excellent analytical skills
- Sound knowledge of and proven experience with designing and implementing policies and capacity building activities to promote sustainable transport
- Prior working experience on sustainable transport issues in Central Asian countries, preferably in Tajikistan
- Demonstration of capacity to provide experienced advice on best practices
- Knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues
- Demonstration of cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Excellent English writing and speaking skills.

## **Qualifications and Experience**

### *Education:*

Masters or equivalent in relevant field of transport, mobility, traffic engineering, civil engineering, urban planning, architecture

### *Work experience:*

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience, preferably in international/multilateral development context;
- At least 10 years of experience in management or implementation of projects related to sustainable transport and urban mobility issues;

### *Knowledge*

- Excellent understanding of Tajikistan's socio-economic situation
- Understanding of current policies and legislation on transport and urban mobility, as relevant to Tajikistan's development context;
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Knowledge in the use of computers and office software packages and handling of web based monitoring systems

### *Personal qualifications*

- Ability to deliver when working under pressure and within changing circumstances
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
- Excellent interpersonal skills

### *Language:*

Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English.

NOTE: The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement in the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Dushanbe city Administration, the Ministry of Transport, UNDP in Tajikistan or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

## **8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this review and revision process lies with UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Tajikistan. UNDP CO will contract the selected Consultant on a lump-sum basis that includes the entire work assignment and production of all deliverables, and all costs related to the required 5 day mission to Dushanbe. The responsible staff of the project and UNDP will be responsible for liaising with the Consultant to provide the project documentation, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government counterparts, etc.

**Timeframe for submission of first draft of the report: 6 weeks upon signing the contract. The revision should be completed by 30 December 2012.** The report shall be submitted to the UNDP in Tajikistan Country Office.

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, project team and UNDP in Tajikistan Country Office. If any discrepancies have emerged between findings of the evaluation team and information available at the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

The activity and tentative timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Estimated duration
Desk review	5 days (home-based)
Briefings for Consultant by UNDP CO, UNDP EEP, Project stakeholders + Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings, presentation of main findings	10 days (5 days – home-based, 5 days – based in Dushanbe, Tajikistan)
Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms	5 days (home-based)
Finalization of the Review and Revision Report (incorporating comments received on first draft)	2 days (home-based)

Working Days:

The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Tajikistan are during November 2012. The assignment is to commence **no later than 10 November 2012 and shall be completed no later than 30 December 2012**. The Consultant is expected to invest approximately 20-22 working days over a period of 60 calendar days, and to cover for all travel-related costs during the required 5-day mission to Dushanbe.

The Consultant is not entitled to any travel allowances and per diems as the payment in the framework of this contract will be made on a lump-sum basis.

## 9. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online on [www.undp.tj](http://www.undp.tj) by **25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, 12:00 CET**

The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a **brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (based on or commenting on the requirements indicated in this TOR).
- **Updated P11 form** including latest experience in similar projects and updated contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from [http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11\\_modified\\_for\\_SCs\\_and\\_ICs.doc](http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc) );
- **Financial Proposal** - specifying a total Lump Sum Amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office and on mission, travel – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs), using the template attached in [Annex 6](#).

---

Please note that the **financial proposal is all-inclusive** and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, office costs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged **travel costs** must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel.

**Payments** will be made to the consultant in two instalments as follows:

- 1) 30% of the lump sum amount following signing of the contract and preparation and submission of the workplan/table of contents to UNDP and prior to the first mission;
- 2) 70% of the lump sum amount upon satisfactory completion of the final report and following confirmation from UNDP that the consultant has delivered on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have **vaccinations/inoculations** when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN **security directives** set forth under [dss.un.org](http://dss.un.org)

**General Terms and conditions** as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/jobs>

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

### **Additional Information:**

- Individual Contract (IC) will be applicable for individual consultants applying in their own capacity. If the applicant is employed by any legal entity, IC would be issued upon submission of Consent letter from the employer acknowledging the engagement with UNDP. Template of General Conditions on IC could be found on: <http://www.undp.org.rs/download/General%20Conditions%20IC.docx>.

**Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials**

The criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness will be used for assessing the quality of the evaluation report:

- The report has to be written in clear language (English)
- The Executive Summary should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- The information in the report has to be complete, well-structured and well presented
- The information in the report has to be reliable i.e. well documented and supported findings
- The information in the report has to address priority or strategic information needs
- Recommendations have to be concrete and implementable

Human rights and gender equality perspective has been taken into account

The evaluation has to be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

## Annex 1. Revised Logical Framework and Project Performance Indicators

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
<b>Goal</b>  Create a sustainable transport system in Dushanbe that could serve as a model for Central Asia					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective</b>  Reduce local and greenhouse gas emissions associated with the transport system in Dushanbe while improving access	Annual emissions from transport sector in the course of project period.  Average daily commute time.	Local and greenhouse gas emissions from transport sector in Dushanbe increase by nearly 3-fold by 2020.  Average daily commute increases nearly 2-fold by 2020.	Annual emissions in 2020 limited to less than 450,000 tonnes  Average daily commute time in 2020 limited to 50% below 2006 levels.	Emissions inventory of transport modes and modelling.  Travel demand surveys; customer satisfaction surveys.	Implementation of package of measures



<i>Outcomes</i>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>1. Lower emissions from vehicles in Dushanbe, with safety and health quality in mind</b>	<p>Fuel efficiency and tailpipe standards for cars registered in Dushanbe.</p> <p>Specifications for installation and use of natural gas and LPG cylinders in vehicles, where used</p> <p>Improved fuel quality standards for petrol and diesel (aromatics, sulphur, lead, octane rating, etc.)</p>	<p>Average fleet efficiency reduced by about 12% by 2020 as a result of normal evolution of fleet, and less than 5% reduction in per mile emissions of hydrocarbons, particulates and oxides of nitrogen</p> <p>Poor safety record for marshrutkas and fuelling operations</p>	<p>Average fleet efficiency improved by 33% by 2020 and 50% reductions in per mile emissions of hydrocarbons, particulates, and oxides of nitrogen</p> <p>Safe and clean vehicle and fuelling operations maintained</p>	Emissions inventory, customer satisfaction surveys	Implementation of vehicle emissions standards

1.1 Testing of indigenously developed filter and review of standards with policies for better enforcement	Implementation of stricter standards for vehicles and fuel quality	Poor monitoring of fuel quality and vehicles	Vehicle emissions standards and petrol, diesel and gas standards enforced to maximise fuel economy and minimise emissions	<p>Certification of fuel efficiency standard and CO and HC standards for all vehicles</p> <p>Certification of natural gas and LPG retrofits and fuelling stations</p> <p>Certification of fuel quality</p>	Availability of qualified inspection/maintenance staff and testing equipment
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>2. Increased use of public transport, particularly trolleybuses.</b>	Modal share, speed of trolleybuses, intermodal connections	Passenger mode shares of buses and trolleybuses decline from about 4% in 2010 to 2 % in 2020	<p>Passenger mode shares of buses and trolley buses increase to about 13% in 2020</p> <p>Increased average speeds of trolleybuses</p> <p>Reduced travel times for all public transport modes.</p> <p>Faster inter-modal transfers.</p>	Travel demand surveys; customer satisfaction surveys	<p>Adequate technical support and financing to improve services</p> <p>Adequate training of personnel on improving service quality</p> <p>Users find public transport attractive</p>

2.1 Travel demand survey and forecast	Completion of travel demand survey	Lack of data on travel demand and demand growth	Improved understanding of travel demand, modal use, origins and destinations, travel demand growth. Improved strategies for integrated land-use/transport planning	Data generation on travel demand, especially along main transport corridors.	Data quality
2.1.1 Travel demand survey	Completion of demand forecast				Availability of simplified transport model applicable for Dushanbe
2.1.2 Simplified transport demand forecast					

2.2	Management of road space to maximise social gain through traffic management schemes that give priority to public transport vehicles and provide improved financial stability	Trolley-bus system technical analysis completed and investment commitments are sought for upgrades	Increased congestion, lack of control over private vehicle use, public transport modes slowed down	Reduced congestion, increased flow of public transport modes, reduced need for private vehicle purchases	Trolley-bus system technical analysis completed and investment commitments are sought for upgrades	Adequate investment for system upgrades from government and private sector
2.2.1	System upgrades for trolley-bus lines	Car population	Car population exceeds 110,000 by 2020	Car population remains below 80,000 by 2020	Development of dispatch centre	Feasibility of implementing exclusive public transport axes.
2.2.2	Implementation of exclusive public transport axes during peak hours, including the possible establishment of physically segregated bus lanes for trolley buses	Development of dispatch centre	Trolleybus lines at current level of maintenance	Increased trolleybuses, and trolleybus lines	Completion of fare-collection study	Political will to develop and implement rules to manage road space, including parking regulations
2.2.3	A public transport management and information centre to direct schedules and dispatch;	Completion of fare-collection study	Poor revenue collection from public transport modes	Operating revenues nearly sufficient to meet costs by 2020	Implementation of fare-collection system	
2.2.4	Introduction of a unified fare system and simplified fare collection for all public transport modes, with fares set to achieve financial equilibrium for the system as a whole without increasing the current average fare level	Implementation of fare-collection system	Poor cost recovery of road use by private transport modes			
2.2.5	Introduction of priced parking for cars	Receipt of targeted parking revenues from cars				

<i>Outcomes</i>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>3. Integrated land use and urban transport planning at the metropolitan level</b>  3.1 Working group on transport and land-use planning, with external consultations on transit corridor planning	Development of integrated land-use/transport plans, with mixed use, high-density zoning along major transport corridors	Weak Integrated land – use urban transport planning in Dushanbe	The Integrated land use and urban transport planning developed, approved and implemented	Review of planning documents	Commitment by urban planning and transport planning agencies to work together   Availability of expertise drawing on best-practices in integrated land-use/transport planning
<b>4. Increased use of non-motorised modes, including bicycles</b>  4.1 Feasibility study on the development of a bicycle manufacturing facility and sales and service network;  4.2 Pilot-testing of bicycle lanes along specified routes	Mode share	Virtually no change in biking and walking	Passenger mode share of bicycles gradually increases to nearly 1% by 2020	Travel demand data  Customer satisfaction surveys	Availability of low-cost bicycles

<b>5. Institutional transformation of government, businesses and general public to embrace sustainable transport</b>	Attitudinal changes towards public transport and evidence of increased civic pride	As public transport share remains modest and private transport are on the rise, institutional mechanisms are unable to cope with rising demand for access, clean environment and rising costs of imported fuel	Institutional change in government, business and general public with increasing efficiency of public transport and cleaner air, absence of congestion, leading Dushanbe to become a model for other cities in Central Asia	Increased frequency of positive references to public transport by civil society, business and media	Adequate involvement of stakeholders from the start  Sufficient commitment to institutional and attitudinal reform
<p>5.1. Targeted packages of technical and institutional training relating to sustainable transport measures for the project staff, transport employees and Khukumat</p> <p>5.1.1 Training on enterprise development for trolleybus, bus and marshrutka operators, including despatch and revenue management.</p> <p>5.1.2 Training to improve maintenance and upgrades for trolleybus enterprise</p> <p>5.1.3 Regulatory development to promote sustainable transport</p>	<p>Completion of training programmes</p> <p>Formation of new rules consonant with sustainable transport goals</p>	No new capacity development among transport managers and planners	<p>Changes in institutional culture towards sustainability.</p> <p>Trained managers and transport planners to better manage system</p>	<p>Reviews of capacity by external consultants</p> <p>Customer satisfaction surveys</p>	<p>Availability of skilled trainers.</p> <p>Willingness to change institutional culture</p>
5.2 Monitoring and evaluation	Successful execution of all elements of project	NA		Monitoring and evaluation plan	Implementation of monitoring and evaluation plan

## **Annex 2. Review and Revision Report: Sample Outline**

(Designed for adaptation to specific project circumstances.)

### **Executive summary**

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

### **Introduction**

- Project background
- Purpose of the review and revision
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the review and revision
- Structure of the review and revision

### **The project(s) and its development context**

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

### **An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy**

### **Key Findings**

- Project formulation
    - Implementation approach
    - Country ownership/Driveness
    - Stakeholder participation
    - Replication approach
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
    - Indicators
    - Management arrangements
  - Implementation
    - Financial Planning
    - Monitoring and evaluation
    - Execution and implementation modalities
    - Management by the UNDP country office
-

- Coordination and operational issues
  - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
- Results
    - Attainment of objectives
    - Sustainability
    - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation and monitoring of the project, including:
  - Updated baseline data
  - Revised logical framework, including key outcomes and targets
  - Recommendation for revised project management and implementation structure and probable project period extension
  - TORs for key international and national consultants
- Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Identification and suggestions for mitigation of potential and critical risks

### **Lessons learned**

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

### **Annexes**

- TOR (without annexes)
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing and Leveraged Resources (see Table 1 attached)
- Project results framework
- Mid-term tracking tool (reviewed by evaluator with his/her comments addressed and incorporated)
- Rating tables



### Annex 3. Co-financing Table

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

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

#### Annex 4. Application of GEF minimum evaluation requirements. Rate tables.

**Table 1.1** Application of GEF minimum evaluation requirements<sup>6,7</sup>

Minimum evaluation requirement	Dimension of evaluation	Basis of evaluation
Achievement of Project objective	▪ Outcomes	Level of satisfaction
	▪ Outputs	
Sustainability of Project outcomes	▪ Financial risks	Likelihood of risk
	▪ Socio-political risks	
	▪ Institutional framework/governance risks	
	▪ Environmental risks	
Monitoring & evaluation system	▪ Design of system	Level of satisfaction
	▪ Application of system	

Satisfaction scale: **Highly Satisfactory**, **Satisfactory**, **Moderately Satisfactory**, **Moderately Unsatisfactory**, **Unsatisfactory**, **Highly Unsatisfactory**

Sustainability scale: **Likely**, **Moderately Likely**, **Moderately Unlikely**, **Unlikely**, **Highly Unlikely**

**Table 1.2** Definitions of levels of satisfaction (GEF, 2008 *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations*)

Rating	Definition
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	The project had <b>no shortcomings</b> in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	The project had <b>minor shortcomings</b> in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	The project had <b>moderate shortcomings</b> in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	The project had <b>significant shortcomings</b> in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	The project had <b>major shortcomings</b> in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	The project had <b>severe shortcomings</b> in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

Sustainability of the Project's results requires rating according to the likelihood of outcomes being sustainable at the Project's termination, based on a 4-point scale that is defined in **Table 1.3**. Evaluations are based on testing progress and achievements against five major criteria

<sup>6</sup> The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006

<sup>7</sup> Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, 2008

(relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability, as appropriate), in accordance with GEF requirements.

**Table 1.3** Definitions of levels of risk to sustainability of Project outcomes (*UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects*, 2012)

Rating	Definition
<b>Likely (L)</b>	<b>Negligible risks</b> to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
<b>Moderately Likely (ML)</b>	<b>Moderate risks</b> , but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained.
<b>Moderately Unlikely (MU)</b>	<b>Substantial risk</b> that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.
<b>Unlikely (U)</b>	<b>Severe risk</b> that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.
<b>Highly Unlikely (HU)*</b>	Expectation that <b>few if any</b> outputs or activities will continue after project closure.
<b>Not Applicable (N/A)</b>	
<b>Unable to Assess (U/A)</b>	

\*Originally, only 4 levels of risk were used to rate sustainability (GEF, 2008) but this fifth level has been introduced recently (UNDP, 2012).

**Table 1.4: Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators**

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

\* *Status of delivery colouring codes:*

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement

Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

\*\* Rating:

**Highly Satisfactory = HS**

Satisfactory = S

Moderately Satisfactory = MS

Moderately Unsatisfactory = MU

Unsatisfactory = U

Highly Unsatisfactory = HU

**Table 1.5: Project Rating**

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE						RATING
	HU	U	MU	MS	S	HS	
<b>PROJECT FORMULATION</b>							
<b>Conceptualization/Design</b>							
<b>Stakeholder participation</b>							
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>							
<b>Implementation Approach</b>							
The use of the logical framework							
Adaptive management							
Use/establishment of information technologies							
Operational relationships between the institutions involved							
Technical capacities							
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>							
<b>Stakeholder participation</b>							
Production and dissemination of information							
Local resource users and NGOs participation							
Establishment of partnerships							
Involvement and support of governmental institutions							
<b>PROJECT RESULTS</b>							
<b>Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives</b>							
Achievement of objective							
Outcome 1							
Outcome 2							
Outcome 3							
Outcome 4							
Outcome 5							
Outcome 6							
<b>OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT &amp; IMPACT</b>							

## **Annex 5. List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators**

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

<b>Document</b>	<b>Description</b>
Project document	Project Document
Project reports	Inception Report Annual work plans Steering committee meeting minutes Relevant tracking tools
Annual Project Report to GEF	PIR 2010 PIR 2011
Other relevant materials:	Maps Project key document outputs

## Annex 6. Cost breakdown template

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

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

## **Annex 7. GEF terminology and project review criteria**

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

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

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

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

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

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

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

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

Examples of effective public involvement include:

### Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

### Consultation and stakeholder participation

---



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

#### Stakeholder participation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing<sup>8</sup>.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

*Co-financing includes:* grants, loans/concessional (compared to market rate), credits, equity investments, in-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>8</sup> Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.