TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the "Sustaining agricultural biodiversity in the face of climate change in Tajikistan" project ("PIMS 3647").

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: (*fully complete the table below*).

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	"Sustaining agricultural biodiversity in the face of climate change in Tajikistan" project			
GEF Project ID:	3129		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	00070411	GEF financing:	1,900,000**	1,629,673
Country:	Tajikistan	IA/EA own (UNDP TRAC):	500,000	452,298
Region:		Government in kind (NBBC):	570,000	482,690
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other in-kind (UNDP AOs):	1,030,000	511,560
		Other in-kind:	0	518,414
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	1,600,000	1,512,664
Executing Agency:	National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center	Total Project Cost:	4,000,000	3,594,635
Other Partners involved:	UNDP Government of the Republic of Tajikistan	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		22/06/2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 2014	Actual: 2014

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to:

The UNDP/GEF's project of "Sustaining agricultural diversity in Tajikistan in the face of climate change" is a five-year nationally implemented project. The implementing partner is the National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan. The project has a GEF budget of USD 1,900,000 and co-financing commitments (including in-kind contributions) of USD 2,100,000. The Project Document was signed between the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Tajikistan, National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center and UNDP Country Office on 22 June 2009.

The aim of this project is to test and demonstrate the replicable ways in which rural farmers and communities can benefit from agro-biodiversity conservation in ways that also build their capacities toward adapting to climate change. This will be achieved using local pilot activities based on the Homologue Approach. The project, in partnership with the National Biodiversity and Biosafety Centre, the UNDP Communities Programme and the GEF Small Grants Programme, features three inter-linked complementary processes. The first of these focuses on strengthening existing policy and regulatory frameworks in support of agro-biodiversity conservation and adaptation to climate change, emphasising the local level implementation. The second focuses on developing community, institutional, and system capacities to enable farmers and agencies to better adapt to climate risks through the conservation and use of agro-biodiversity. The third focuses on the development of agro-enterprises that support the conservation and production of agro-biodiversity friendly products, with a view to providing farmers and communities with alternative sources of income to offset the negative impacts and shocks related to climate change.

Three project outcomes defined in the Project Document are: 1) Agrobiodiversity conservation and climate resilience are embedded into the national policy and local development plans; 2) Farmers have the knowledge and skills to address climate change risks and protect agrobiodiversity; 3) Enabling environment for market development for agrobiodversity products developed.*(provide a project summary including project goal and outcomes. Also, in cases where the GEF funded project forms part of a larger programme, specify if the TE is to cover the entire programme or only the GEF component).*

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[1] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP

[1] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Zeravshan, Rasht, Baljuvan and Shurobad including the following project sites: Shurobod, Rasht, Baljuan and Zerafshan and 36 sub-districts Jamoats *(list)*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (*list key stakeholders*).

- National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center of the Republic of Tajikistan
- Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan (CEP) and its subsidiary bodies
- Ministry of Agriculture
- National Center for Genetic Resources
- Agency on Hydrometeorology
- Agency on Land Management
- Academy of Science of the Republic of Tajikistan
- Institute of Botany
- Local government authorities at jamoat (sub-district,) district and regional levels
- Jamoat Resource Centers
- Micro Finance Institutions
- Local farmers
- Non-governmental organizations
- UNDP Country Office
- UNDP/GEF Istanbul Regional Hub
- The GEF Secretariat, who is not involved in project implementation, but to whom the Evaluation Report to be prepared under this Terms of Reference will be submitted.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**rating**
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[2]

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Tajikistan. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

[2] A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	*3* days *(recommended: 2-4)*	*date*
Evaluation Mission	*8* days (*r: 7-15)*	*date*
Draft Evaluation Report	*7* days (*r: 5-10*)	*date*
Final Report	*2* days *(r;: 1-2*)	*date*

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national consultant (*1-2 international /national evaluators).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (*If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report).* The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

International Consultant (Team Leader)

Duties and Responsibilities:

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

Required Qualifications:

- Master's degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics or other related areas;
- 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the agrobiodiversity conservation projects, preferably with components on climate change;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating agrobiodiversity conservation projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project);
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based management policies and procedures;
- **Recognized expertise in the biodiversity conservation and excellent understanding of climate change issues;**
- **Familiarity with biodiversity policies in CIS would be an asset;**
- **Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;**
- Fluent in English both written and spoken;
- Fluency in Russian will be considered an asset;
- Computer literacy.

National Consultant

Duties and Responsibilities

- Collection of background materials upon request by Evaluation Team Leader/International Consultant;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans and evaluation report outlines;
- Desk review of materials;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders; provide both oral and written translation from/to English/Russian/Tajik, whenever necessary;

- Field visit and assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in developing the first draft of the MTE report;
- Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in finalization of the Mid-Term Evaluation report.

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

Required Qualifications:

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

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at www.tj.undp.org and www.jobs.undp.org (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by April 8, 2015 (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Logical Framework Matrix and Outputs – proposed changes

	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)				
Goal	**To conserve the agro-biodiversity of Tajikistan in the face of climate change**				
Project Strategy	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Objective: Globally significant agro-biodiversity (ABD) conservation and adaptation to climate change (CC) are embedded in the national and local agricultural and rural development policies and practices of Tajikistan.	Number of hectares of landscape where climate resilient agrobiodiversity conservation is mainstreamed.	Oblast/jamoat plans are not considering climate resilient agrobiodiversity	Oblast/jamoat plans incorporate priority ABD and CC issues covering1.5 million hectares in four districts (Shurobod, Rasht, Baljuan and Zerafshan) and 36 sub-districts (jamoats), of which 9 jamoats covering 150,000 hectares are targeted for project interventions.	BD2 Tracking Tool (Annex F)	Oblast and jamoats supportive of the conservation of climate resilient agrobiodiversity.
	Farms in pilot areas have the capacity to implement in situ and ex-situ conservation of climate resilient ABD as means to cope with impacts of CC through implementation of Homologue Approach;	Limited local capacity for in-situ and ex-situ conservation of climate resilient agrobiodiversity. Few ex-situ collections of germplasm as identified through GBIF database	Ex situ and in situ conservation that provides adapted germplasm for crop improvement and climate resilience programmes in Tajikistan and globally. Tajik germplasm used and valued by farms/ communities as means to adapt to climate change.	Accessions of viable germplasm and germplasm exchange systems, typified by the GBIF database. Use of germplasm in crop improvement programmes as typified by the reports of the relevant national and international plant breeding institutes	Support for community based in situ conservation and management. Germplasm is collected, characterized, and viably conserved. Lack of inter-agency dialogue at the local and national level prevents development of adaptive and institutional capacity and strategies to manage CC.
Outcome 1: Agro-biodiversity conservation and	Regulatory framework at the national and local level promotes: (i) conservation of agrobiodiversity	Enabling environment at national and local level is not conducive for agrobiodiversity conservation and its potential role for climate adaptation and	Agro-biodiversity friendly and climate resilient policies and practices embedded into national policy and local development plans contributing to improved agrobiodiversity	Official gazette	Food security, poverty reduction and development related strategies take priority over biodiversity conservation.

	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)				
Goal	**To conserve the agro-biodiversity of Tajikistan in the face of climate change**				
Project Strategy	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
adaptation to climate change through supportive policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks	within current production systems and the adaptive capacity to cope with climate change. (ii) implementation of in-situ and ex-situ conservation measures	future food security	conservation in the face of climate change in four project areas covering 150,000 ha.	Policies and regulations. Monitoring and control will be conducted through existing scientific, political and legislative acts at national and local level.	Assumption that crop and climate modelling is accurate: A risk is a lack of confidence in modelling results by national institutions. The same strategies work to reduce ABD through development-oriented land use change. Bureaucratic barriers: • Unwillingness of Hukumat and Jamoats to introduce new methods of ABD conservation in face of CC. • Low awareness of current climatic change scenarios. • Farmers interest in other crops for planning and developing their households. • Natural climatic and geographical conditions of project areas do not favour the growth of one indicator crop (selected by project) for benefits in long term period. • National Genetic Resources Center is not able to develop as a policy development agency without constant support of donors; its activity is limited to specific scientific research; and/or it does not impact on forming of sustainable ABD on the base of genetic resources. However, the Center actively maintains a national data base on ABD resources.
	Institutional framework in place at the national and local level facilitates implementation of ABD relevant policies, legislation and regulation in 4 pilot areas.	Lack of climate and crop models prohibit strategic planning and adaptive capacity development in face of climate change and threats to food security.	National CC agencies generate climate and crop models that provide accurate and timely information to local stakeholders. Extension services to increase farmer capacity regarding ABD conservation and management of climate resilient crop wild relatives exist. Extension package in place in 4 pilot sites covering approx. 150,000 ha (each using one important landrace or locally adapted cultivar as entry point to ABD friendly, climate resilient production practices).	By-laws of extension services Project reports	

	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)				
Goal	**To conserve the agro-biodiversity of Tajikistan in the face of climate change**				
Project Strategy	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					• Restructuring of partner agencies- (mainly state organizations) and change of authority may complicate finalizing regulatory frameworks for ABD conservation. • Lifestyle peculiarities of local communities in mountain areas will constrain establishment of agro-enterprises[3]. (Very small villages and households, with minimum 2-3 families; remoteness, relief with steep slopes and lack of transport.)
Outcome 2: Improved capacity for sustaining agro-biodiversity in the face of climate change	Improved capacity for ex-situ conservation measures of globally significant and climate resilient agrobiodiversity	Local communities are not aware of implications of climate change and are not working towards the development of adaptive strategies and capacities.	Ex situ conservation of globally significant ABD (landraces and CWRs) in gene (e.g. seed) banks and as living collections (in botanic gardens, nurseries, farms) in the case of recalcitrant CWRs, in collaboration with local institutions (including walnut, pistachio, pomegranate, fig, mulberry, apricot and almond)	Numbers of viable accessions conserved ex situ. Reports confirm existence of programmes.	Ex situ facilities are incapable of conserving viable germplasm. Natural disasters (drought, flood, diseases, parasites)in project areas and locations of situ and ex situ conservation interventions
	Improved capacity of farmers in four project areas to design and implement on-farm agrobiodiversity conservation measures as an adaptive capacity to climate risks and variability.	Lack of socio-ecological resilience to climate variability and shocks. Negligible national and local capacity to cope with climate risks and variability	On-farm conservation of wild relatives and landraces of globally significant ABD in 40 home gardens/farms in 4 project areas.	Numbers or total area of CWRs conserved on-farm and numbers of viable landraces conserved in situ on farms and home gardens.	• Local interest in alternative poverty reducing strategies work against in situ conservation. • Natural disasters in mountain areas could complicate the progress of in-situ conservation of wild relatives of global significant ABD.

[3] The term agro-enterprise is used in the sense of small-scale (farmer or farming community) processing and/or marketing facilities for local produce. It does not imply large-scale task-oriented production facilities, as understood in the Russian language.

	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)				
Goal	**To conserve the agro-biodiversity of Tajikistan in the face of climate change**				
Project Strategy	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
				Project reviews Remote sensing tools, GIS.	
	Increased awareness of the importance of conserving CWRs in their natural habitat	Farmers are permitted to collect CWRs in reserves (IUCN IV) and not considering the long-term conservation of ABD	Farmers are capacitated in in-situ conservation of wild relatives of globally significant ABD in its natural habitat (including reserves) in 4 project areas.	Number of CWR species growing in natural habitat identified and categorised in project area (including areas).	
	Farming communities have the capacity to implement the results of homologue approach implemented in 4 project so as to enable the adaptation of their current production practices to current and future climate risks and variability.	No existing community-to-community seed and germplasm exchange programmes based on climate change impacts.	Improved capacity of farmers (men/women) in >40 home gardens/farms in 4 pilot sites to participate in implementation of the Homologue Approach and to initialize own germplasm exchanges to cope with future impacts of CC.	Reports, quantification of seed and germplasm exchange.	Farmers/communities willing to engage and participate in Homologue Approach. Community interest and participation in the exchange schemes. • Germplasm exchanges between communities in small remote villages (the same are very many in project areas) will be ineffective, since there is one or two communities in the village and one community as a rule consists of only a few households. • Global and regional germplasm exchanges will be limited (until elaboration of special mechanism) due to establishment of international genetic resources transition regime in accordance with Nagoya Protocol to CBD).
Outcome 3:	ABD friendly agro-enterprises	Agro-enterprises are small-	Sustainable national or	Local incomes, cost benefit	• Lack of demand for ABD products in developed

	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)				
Goal	**To conserve the agro-biodiversity of Tajikistan in the face of climate change**				
Project Strategy	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Market conditions favour sustainable agro-biodiversity production	generate sustainable income of at least 20% more than the current baseline by 2014.	scale, localized and seasonal, with negligible access to international or national markets and business opportunities	international value chains developed for at least one organic environmentally-friendly ADB product in each of 4 project areas and improvements in local livelihoods demonstrated.	analyses, independent sustainability of agro-enterprises as obtained by project surveys Evidence of local income generation. Existence of agro-enterprises based on ABD	countries due to financial crisis. • It will require a few years for ABD agro-enterprises will to become established and start generating income, as they are absent from the project sites. Moreover, there are no mechanisms in place for compiling income statistics at local or national levels. Thus, it will only be possible to generate such income data from those engaged in the project. • In view of lack of infrastructure in remote mountain areas, it is impossible to deliver ABD goods to markets in a timely manner. • Consultative agribusiness centres will not become financially sustainable for a long time without project support and farmers will not be able to pay for their services following project completion.
	Value chains of ABD-friendly products in domestic market Favourable conditions exist for access to overseas markets.	Non-existent and/or unorganized marketing of local ABD goods to national and international markets	Up to four (fruit and nuts) agrobiodiversity certified and/or non-certified products marketed and sold in new national and/or international markets.	Reports on volume and timeliness of production. Cost benefit analysis. Action Plan on development of markets for agrobiodiversity in mountain areas.	

Outputs (reviewed and revised 13-09-2012):
1.1. Agrobiodiversity conservation and adaptation principles mainstreamed into local and national policies and programmes. 1.2. Extension package for promoting climate resilient farming varieties developed and integrated into the national extension service and delivery system. 1.3. Local authority capacities improved with regard to strengthened policy, sector guidelines and plans in support of ABD conservation and adaptation to CC in 4 pilot areas, which is implemented in cooperation with NGOs, communities, farmers through joint integrated practices, including market development. 1.4. Capacity building programs implemented to ensure institutions charged with responsibility for managing ex-and in-situ gene banks are effective. 1.5. ABD policies applied in 4 pilot areas and adopted in >40 home gardens/farms. 1.6. Development of long-term strategy for conservation of ABD and adaptation to climate change.
2.1. Farmers in the 4 pilot areas provided with skills and knowledge to increase farm productivity (and food security) using climate resilient agro-biodiversity friendly practices. 2.2. Community-based participatory methods (building on traditional knowledge) developed and implemented for ex situ conservation, especially of recalcitrant materials (seed that cannot be stored ex situ). 2.3. Database of Tajikistan's valuable ABD germplasm established and networked for global, regional, national and local access (including communities) to support development of ABD programmes and improvement of cultivars. 2.4. Identification of CWRs of local ABD and its in situ protection in natural forest ecosystems, ensures its long-term conservation and provides a reservoir of germplasm adapted to climate change impacts for use in increasing productiveness of local fruits and nuts in 4 pilot areas. 2.5. Climate change and crop modelling facilitates the selection of the most appropriate homologue sites that represent present and future conditions. 2.6. Sustainable management strategies for the 4 project areas and their designation as sources of climate resilient wild crop relatives. 2.7. Awareness campaigns in partnership with the GEF SGP address conservation of agro-biodiversity and adaptation to climate change.
3.1. Supply chain approach developed for marketing certified, climate resilient ABD products from 4 project areas. 3.2. Improved marketing of climate resilient ABD products (including international export) in 4 project areas, based on added values, strengthened supply chains, branding and certification.

3.3. Crop certification established for ABD products, increasing farmers' ability to market products and sell them at a premium.

3.4. Establishment and development of food processing agro-enterprises supported by small grants (GEF SGP) and microcredits (MLFs facilitated by UNDP Communities Programme, JRCs and Business Advisory Centres) within 9 target jamoats.

3.5. Improved Business Advisory Centres and Jamoat Resource Centres implement programs on capacity development to support agro-enterprises and farmers supply markets with climate resilient ABD products.

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

(to be added

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

Document	Description
Project document	**Project Document**
Project reports	**Inception Report** **Mid-Term Evaluation** **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 C: Evaluation Questions

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) ***Impact Ratings:*** 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[4]

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

[4]www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[5]

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[6])

1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated[7])

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

[5]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[6] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[7] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____