

TERMS OF REFERENCE

GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Tajikistan (1999-2014)

1. Background and Introduction

1. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) are one of the main evaluation streams of work of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office. By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries.

2. GEF eligible countries are chosen for CPEs based on a multi-step selection process¹ that ensures that all countries in the GEF could be selected. The set of criteria includes the size, diversity and maturity of their portfolio of projects, coverage of previous GEFIEO evaluations, and additional criteria, such as 'evaluability', synergy with other country evaluations, and with Council agenda subjects. Among several considerations, Tajikistan was selected as it has a comparatively large, diverse and mature portfolio (24 projects, 6 of which are completed), which has an emphasis on biodiversity (6 projects), multi-focal (6 projects) and climate change (5 projects) and has significant co-financing amounts. Furthermore, Tajikistan includes a good number of ongoing projects (9 projects), and a number of recently approved projects and projects in the pipeline (9 projects).

3. Tajikistan, officially known as the Republic of Tajikistan, is a landlocked mountainous country in Central Asia. It is bordered by Afghanistan to the south, Uzbekistan to the west, Kyrgyzstan to the north, and China to the east. Tajikistan has land area of 143,100 square km. The mountainous region is dominated by the Trans-Alay Range in the north and the Pamirs in the southeast and more than fifty percent of the country is over 3,000 meters above sea level².

4. Tajikistan is one of the world's poorest countries and one of the poorest countries of Central Asia and of the former soviet republics. Tajikistan economy depends on remittances and commodity exports that make it vulnerable to global economic conditions³. Tajikistan plunged into civil war almost as soon as it became independent from the Soviet Union in 1991⁴. Political turmoil and the civil war that lasted into 1997 did enormous damage to Tajikistan's economy. Damages were estimated to extend to 80 percent of the Tajikistan's industries⁵. Tajikistan's economic growth declined from 7.5 percent to 6.7 percent in the first half of 2014, and is expected to ease further to 6.5 percent due to spillover effect from the slowdown in Russia⁶.

¹ GEF IEO (2010) Note on the Selection Process and Criteria for the GEF Country Portfolio Evaluations:

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/2054>

² CIA Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ti.html>

³ U.S. State Department: <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5775.htm>

⁴ BBC Country Profile: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-16201032>

⁵ Library of Congress: <http://countrystudies.us/tajikistan/34.htm>

⁶ World Bank Country Profile: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tajikistan/overview#1>

5. Tajikistan's store of natural resources is relatively modest. The country has high hydropower potential and most of the country's energy supply is through hydropower (98%; while coal is about 1.8%; other – wind and solar 0.2%). Tajikistan also has some petroleum, uranium, mercury, brown coal, lead, zinc, antimony, tungsten, silver, and gold⁷.

6. High demographic growth and constant socio-economic development have put pressure on natural resources and caused environmental degradation. Tajikistan's main environmental problems are deterioration of water resources, inadequate sanitation facilities; increasing levels of soil salinity; industrial pollution; excessive pesticides⁸.

7. GEF intervention in Tajikistan started in 1999 with the *Programme for Phasing Out Ozone Depleting Substances*. For the purposes of the CPE, Tajikistan portfolio has 24 national projects with over \$34 million of GEF finance and \$119 million of co-finance. Tajikistan participates in 15 regional projects totaling over \$69 million in GEF finance and \$171 million in co-finance. Of the national projects, 9 are under implementation, 6 are completed, and 9 have been cleared or approved awaiting implementation start. The largest GEF focal areas are biodiversity and climate change with 6 and 5 projects respectively and multi focal area projects with 6 projects. These are followed by persistent organic pollutants (POPs) (4 projects) and land degradation (3 projects). The portfolio is composed of 7 full size projects (FSP), 9 medium size projects (MSP) and 8 enabling activities (EA). The number of projects initiated across the various GEF replenishment phases has varied over the years. The GEF-2 phase had 3 projects, GEF-3 had 9, GEF-4 and GEF-5 had 5, and GEF-6 currently has 2 projects.

8. The national portfolio in Tajikistan is implemented through six different GEF Agencies. UNDP has the largest share of the Tajikistan portfolio with 14 projects amounting to \$15.2 million, followed by the World Bank and UNEP with 6 projects each amounting to \$10.65 and 1.55 million respectively. ADB, EBRD, and UNIDO have 1 project each with \$3.5, \$2.37, and \$0.18 million respectively. Additionally, 1 project is jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP with \$0.9 million. Co-financing and total project finance amounts for the national portfolio are outlined in Table 1 below.

9. Tajikistan is party to the Biodiversity, Climate Change, Climate Change-Kyoto Protocol, Desertification, Ozone Layer Protection, and Wetlands conventions⁹. In biodiversity, GEF support has focused on biodiversity conservation and implementation of the National Biosafety Framework. In climate change, the projects have focused on both improving energy efficiency and developing renewable energy. Under POPs, GEF intervention focused on polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) management and meeting conventions obligations¹⁰.

⁷ CIA Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ti.html>

⁸ CIA Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ti.html>

⁹ CIA Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ti.html>

¹⁰ List of projects in Tajikistan are included in Annex C.

Table 1: GEF Support to National Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency

Focal Area	Agency	No. of Projects	GEF Financing (US\$)	Co-finance (US\$)	Total (US\$)
Biodiversity	UNDP	3	1,390,000	785,000	2,175,000
	UNEP	2	1,060,000	774,000	1,834,000
	World Bank	1	750,000	198,250	948,250
Total		6	3,200,000	1,757,250	4,957,250
Chemicals and Waste	UNDP	1	1,991,000	8,000,000	9,991,000
Total		1	1,991,000	8,000,000	9,991,000
Climate Change	EBRD	1	2,727,067	23,896,400	26,623,467
	UNDP	4	3,392,000	12,331,127	15,723,127
Total		5	6,119,067	36,227,527	42,346,594
Land Degradation	ADB	1	3,500,000	19,810,000	23,310,000
	UNDP	1	975,000	1,053,000	2,028,000
	World Bank	1	5,400,000	16,860,000	22,260,000
Total		3	9,875,000	37,723,000	47,598,000
Multi Focal Area	UNDP	5	7,450,570	22,295,000	29,745,570
	World Bank	1	4,500,000	13,300,000	17,800,000
Total		6	11,950,570	35,595,000	47,545,570
Ozone Depleting Substances	UNDP/UNEP	1	898,943	271,502	1,170,445
Total		1	898,943	271,502	1,170,445
POPs	UNEP	1	494,323	20,000	514,323
	UNIDO	1	181,850	178,000	359,850
Total		2	676,173	198,000	874,173
GRAND TOTAL		24	34,710,753	119,772,279	154,483,032

Source: GEF PMIS data cross-checked with GEF Agencies' data

10. Within the national portfolio, 1 FSP is completed, 3 are under implementation and 3 are in the pipeline. 4 MSPs are completed, 3 are under implementation and 2 are pending. 1 EA is completed, 3 are under implementation and 3 are in the pipeline.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

11. The purpose of the Tajikistan CPE is to provide the GEF Council and the country with an assessment of results and performance of the GEF supported activities in the country, and of how the GEF supported activities link into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF. Based on this overall purpose, the Tajikistan CPE has the following specific objectives:

- Evaluate the **effectiveness, results** and **sustainability** of GEF support in Tajikistan, with attention to the sustainability of achievements at the project level and progress toward impact for global environmental benefits.¹¹
- Evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency** of GEF support in Tajikistan from the points of view of national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate of achieving of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures.¹²
- Provide **feedback and knowledge sharing** to: (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process to allocate resources and to develop policies and strategies, (2) Tajikistan on its collaboration and participation in the GEF, and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF projects and activities.

12. The Tajikistan CPE will also provide additional evaluative evidence to other evaluations being conducted by the Office. The evaluation will address the performance of the GEF portfolio in Tajikistan in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness as well as the contributing factors to this performance. It will also analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs are conducted to bring to the attention of Council different experiences and lessons on how the GEF is implemented at the national level from a wide variety of countries. CPEs do not aim at evaluating/rating the performance of GEF Agencies, national entities (agencies/departments, national governments or involved civil society organizations), or individual projects. Other users of the evaluation include the Tajikistan Government as well as the national executing agencies and institutions involved with GEF projects.

3. Key Evaluation Questions

13. GEF CPEs are guided by a set of key questions that should be answered based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the evaluative information and perceptions collected during the evaluation exercise. The Tajikistan CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

Effectiveness, Results and Sustainability

- a) To what extent has GEF support to Tajikistan been effective in producing results by focal area at the project as well as at the aggregate level (program and country portfolio)?
- b) To what extent has GEF support led to progress toward impact through broader adoption mechanisms¹³ over an extended period of time after completion?
- c) To what extent has GEF support been effective in sustaining the knowledge generated and shared by GEF projects with partners in Tajikistan (national stakeholders and GEF Agencies) and partners outside of the country?

¹¹**Effectiveness:** the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; **Results:** in GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects; **Sustainability:** the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

Extracted from the GEF M&E Policy, GEF IEO (2010)

¹²**Relevance:** the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated; **Efficiency:** the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. *Ibid.*

¹³See paragraph 21 and 28.

- d) To what extent has GEF support to Tajikistan been effective making a contribution to chemicals issues, specifically reduction of POPs?
- e) To what extent has GEF support contributed to reducing gender inequality and promoting women's empowerment?

Relevance

- a) Has GEF support to Tajikistan been relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits in the climate change, biodiversity, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?
- b) Has GEF support to Tajikistan been relevant to the Tajik environmental priorities and sustainable development needs and challenges, including poverty alleviation and creation of sustainable livelihoods in the form of environmental sustainable jobs?
- c) To what extent have the GEF and its Agencies been supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making processes in Tajikistan?

Efficiency

- a) How much time, effort and financial resources (including co-financing) did it take to formulate and implement projects in Tajikistan, according to GEF support modality?
 - b) What have been and are the roles, types of engagement, coordination and synergies among different stakeholders in project implementation in Tajikistan?
 - c) Have there been synergies between: a) GEF Agencies in GEF programming and implementation; b) national institutions for GEF support; and c) GEF and other donors' support in Tajikistan?
 - d) What role did Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play – both at design and implementation – in project adaptive management and overall efficiency in Tajikistan?
14. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in an evaluation matrix, which are presented in Annex B.

4. Scope and Limitations

15. The Tajikistan CPE will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all active GEF Agencies in all active focal areas. It will also include applicable GEF corporate activities and a selection of regional programs, as Tajikistan is involved in several regional activities with large representation and special relevance to the country. Nevertheless, the main focus of the evaluation will be the projects implemented within the country boundaries (i.e. the national projects) be they full-size, medium-size or enabling activities.

16. The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes an important focus of the evaluation. This includes: a historic assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities; the legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced; GEF Agencies' country strategies; and GEF policies, programs and strategies.

17. The status of the project will determine the expected CPE focus (see Table 2).

Table 2: Focus of evaluation according to project status

Project Status	Focus		On an exploratory basis	
	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>Results/Benefits</i>
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	Not applicable	Not applicable

18. The GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. However, since 2010 the GEF has started supporting countries in undertaking National Portfolio Formulation Exercises (NPFEs) on a voluntary basis. These exercises serve as a priority setting tool for countries and as a guide for GEF Agencies as they assist recipient countries. These country programming efforts are rather recent, which limits their usefulness in evaluations such as CPEs, which examine the period since the start of GEF operations, i.e. sometimes 20 years back. This is why generally CPEs entail some degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the CPE evaluation framework described here will be adapted along with the other relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF portfolio in Tajikistan.

19. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The Tajikistan CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the contribution of the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between GEF supported activities and their implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, through analysis of roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities and knowledge sharing.

20. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts, and obviously include outputs as well. This assessment will focus at the aggregate level by focal area, with an historical perspective. Special attention will be paid to the identification of factors affecting the level of outcome achievements and progress towards impact achieved over time, as well as to the risks that may prevent further progress to long term impacts. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional strengthening and capacity building, and awareness.

21. Assessing the specific impacts – or progress towards impact – of GEF support is challenging. GEF support is typically designed to interact with initiatives of other agents such as governments, the private sector, civil society organizations and other donors. Even where the GEF has funded specific components within a project that may be distinguished from those funded by other partners, these have been funded on a premise that they will be able to draw on the synergies with components funded by the other partners, and vice versa. Contextual factors add to those complexities. In fact, the GEF faces diverse situations when assessing impact. Challenges for assessing impact are different when supporting a discrete activity such as the introduction of a technology in a specific context from a situation in which GEF supports broader processes that take place at the national, regional or global level, were a number

of contextual factors and actors have a role. Interventions also differ in terms of the time horizons within which impacts can be observed and measured.

22. In recent years, the Office has developed a general Theory of Change (TOC) applicable to the various modalities and scales of GEF support, and devised a corresponding progress towards impact analysis framework – based on the concept of Broader Adoption – to help dealing with the complexities described when assessing progress towards impact of GEF support¹⁴. Progress toward impact of a sample of completed projects in Tajikistan will be assessed through case studies which use the described progress towards impact analysis framework (see paragraph 28). Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits.

23. The inclusion of regional and global projects increases the complexity of this type of evaluations since these projects are developed and approved within different contexts (i.e. regional or global policies and strategies) than national projects. However, some regional projects in which Tajikistan participates will be included based on criteria such as the relevance of the regional project for the country, the implementation unit being located in the country, the existence of project demonstration sites in the country, among others.

5. Methodology

24. The Tajikistan CPE will be conducted by staff of the Independent Evaluation Office and consultants from a consortium made up of Societa Italiana di Monitoraggio (SIM) SpA in Italy in association with B.A.R.S. Consulting Ltd from Tajikistan. The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and the GEF.

25. SIM/B.A.R.S. staff qualify under the Office's Ethical Guidelines, and the consortium has signed a declaration of interest to indicate the absence of any recent (last 3-5 years) relationship with GEF support in the country. The Operational Focal Point (OFP) in the country will act as resource person in facilitating the evaluation process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits, and the initial and final consultation workshops.

26. The evaluation team will foster comprehensive stakeholder engagement and communication all along the evaluation, with the following objectives: (a) to ensure the evaluation process is transparent and participatory while at the same time independent; (2) to gather additional information and data that can be triangulated with more traditional data sources; and (3) to promote the utility of the evaluation once completed, by facilitating learning and dissemination of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

27. These objectives will be achieved through a number of means including in-country stakeholder consultation workshops at the start and completion of the evaluation and an online stakeholder consultation platform moderated by the evaluation team. The platform will be used to discuss key evaluation questions, share information on the evaluation process and fieldwork, and conduct due diligence on the draft evaluation products.

28. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The expected sources of information include:

¹⁴ GEF IEO (2013) OPS5 Technical Document #2: Impact of the GEF

- 1) *Project level*: project documents, project implementation reports, mid-term evaluations, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;
 - 2) *Country level*: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
 - 3) *GEF Agency level*: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews;
 - 4) *Other evaluations*: evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations previously conducted either by the Office, by the evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments;
 - 5) *Stakeholder interviews (individual and focus groups)*: with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF OFP and all other relevant government departments, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the country), GEF Agencies and the national UN convention focal points; GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
 - 6) *Field visits*: to selected project sites, using methods and tools developed by the Office, such as the Progress towards Impact case studies guideline;
 - 7) *Country ownership assessment*: based on an IEO designed analysis framework to assess degree of country ownership and drive-ness of the GEF portfolio;
 - 8) *Online stakeholder consultation platform*: in the form of an email group, an online platform was launched during the stakeholder workshop held in Dushanbe during the scoping mission, to facilitate stakeholder consultation and engagement, gather information and data, and stimulate learning and knowledge sharing during the entire evaluation process. A webinar on evaluation scoping was held soon after for gather further feedback on the key evaluation questions.
 - 9) *National stakeholder consultation workshops*: at the start and completion of the evaluation, to gather feedback and comments, any eventual data gaps and/or errors of interpretation.
29. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support (i.e., linkages between GEF support and national priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, etc.) and to measure GEF results (i.e., progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) as well as performance (aggregating implementation and completion ratings available from terminal evaluations and terminal evaluation reviews). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used where appropriate.
30. The Evaluation Team will use the standard tools and protocols for CPEs and adapt these to the national context. These tools include a project review protocol (PRP) to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects, an outline for the Country Environmental Legal Framework (CELf) analysis and the Global Environmental Benefits Assessment (GEBA), and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders. As indicated earlier, country ownership and driven-ness will be analyzed using an analysis framework being developed based on the one used for a similar analysis in OPS5¹⁵. Progress

¹⁵GEFIEO (2013) OPS5 Technical Document #6: Meta-Evaluation on Country Ownership and Drivenness

toward impact will be analyzed by designing and conducting a series of case studies on a selection of completed projects through a focal area and/or geographic cluster approach. The tool will be the TOC for broader adoption mechanisms for progress to impact developed by the Office for OPS5¹⁶ adapted to suit country portfolio analysis.

31. The Tajikistan CPE will include visits to project sites for field observation of results achieved. The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized at the start of the evaluation phase, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. The Evaluation Team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits.

32. Quality assurance will be performed on the final report by a Peer Review Panel (PRP) composed of independent national experts. The expertise provided covers the relevant scientific and technical aspects of the peer review function related to the GEF focal areas.

6. Process and Outputs

33. These country-specific Terms of Reference (TOR) have been prepared based on visits to Tajikistan conducted by the Office in October 2014 and March 2015. The first mission was conducted with the purpose of exploring existing opportunities for and interest in engaging with the available national institutional and individual expertise, both for providing quality assurance and for conducting country-based evaluation data gathering and analysis. Evaluation scoping was conducted during this first mission to Dushanbe as well as through on-line stakeholder consultation, which helped identifying key issues to be included in the evaluation. The second mission was an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation and formally introduce the SIM/B.A.R.S. team to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the evaluation preparatory phase, and set the scene for the evaluation phase, during which the Evaluation Team will collect data and information, review literature and other information sources to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence. This evaluation phase will include the following steps:

- Preparation of specific inputs to the evaluation, including:
 - a. *GEF Portfolio Database*, which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (by GEF Agency and focal area), their implementation status, project cycle information, GEF financing and co-financing, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
 - b. *Country Environmental Legal Framework (CELF)*¹⁷, which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented in Tajikistan. This document will be based on information on national environmental legislation, environmental policies of the government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by Tajikistan presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular modalities of GEF support.
 - c. *Global Environmental Benefits Assessment (GEBA)*¹⁸, which provides an assessment of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ GEF IEO (2012) Note: CPE Country Environmental Legal Frameworks

¹⁸ GEF IEO (2010) Global Environmental Benefits Assessment – Outline

(STAR) (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) and others used in projects documents.

- d. *Progress towards Impact Case Studies*¹⁹, selected in consultation with the Office's staff and conducted to assess progress of a selection of completed projects towards achieving environmental impact. Case studies will report on selected projects and/or clusters of project in a specific GEF focal area in a national geographic region.
 - e. *Project Review Protocols (PRPs)*²⁰, which are project evaluation templates that contain in a concise yet comprehensive form, all the necessary evaluative information needed for conducting an aggregate analysis of the effectiveness and results, the relevance and the efficiency of the portfolio.
- *Triangulation*²¹ of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. The procedure elaborated by the Office in its CPEs applies a systematic triangulation approach that cross-checks the entirety of the empirical evaluative evidence and data collected against the set of key evaluation questions. This procedure will be conducted during a data consolidation mission to Tajikistan by the Office's Task Manager working with the SIM/B.A.R.S. team. The aim will be to consolidate the evidence gathered thus far, identify missing information and analysis gaps and arrive at key preliminary findings.
 - *Aide Mémoire*, which will summarize the preliminary findings and will be distributed to stakeholders one week prior to the final consultation workshop. During this mission, additional analysis, meetings, document reviews and/or fieldwork might be undertaken as needed.
 - *Stakeholder Consultation Workshop*, conducted with the Government and other national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the key preliminary findings contained in the Aid-Mémoire circulated prior to the workshop. The workshop will be an opportunity to identify and correct eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the Evaluation Team. The workshop will also be used to identify potential areas for recommendations and/or conclusions and to verify their concreteness and feasibility.
 - *Draft Tajikistan CPE Report*, which incorporates feedback obtained at the final stakeholder consultation workshop, and is subsequently circulated to stakeholders. Before circulation the draft report is peer reviewed.
 - *Final Tajikistan CPE Report*, incorporating the comments received to the draft. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the Report. The Focal Points consult with the Government and assist in preparing a response.

34. The final CPE report will be published on the GEF Independent Evaluation Office website and will be distributed to the GEF Council Members, GEF Secretariat, the GEF Operational Focal Point in Tajikistan, focal points of the environmental conventions in Tajikistan, the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF projects and activities in Tajikistan. Learning products from this evaluation will also be identified and developed for specific and targeted audiences.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰GEF IEO (2012) Guidelines on Project Review Protocols

²¹GEF IEO (2010) Methodological Note on Triangulation Analysis in Country Portfolio Evaluations

7. Evaluation Key Milestones

35. The Evaluation will be conducted between March 2015 and December 2015. The key milestones of the Evaluation are presented below:

Preparation	Status
Initial Communication	August 2014 (completed)
Preparatory work and preliminary data gathering	August 2014–Oct. 2014 (completed)
Pre-evaluation and Scoping Mission	Oct. 2014 (completed)
Launch of the online platform	February 2015 (completed)
Contracting of Consultants (SIM/BARS)	March 2015 (completed)
Tajikistan-specific CPE Terms of Reference finalized and circulated	June 2015 (completed)
Evaluation phase: literature review, data gathering	April-July 2015
Country Environmental Legal Framework (CELF)	April-June 2015
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment (GEBA)	April-June 2015
Interviews, GEF portfolio database, project review protocols	March 2015 – July 2015
Progress towards Impact Case Studies	June-July 2015
Consolidation: triangulation, additional analysis, gap-filling	August 2015
Preparation of an Aide Mémoire (report on preliminary findings)	September 2015
Stakeholder Consultation Workshop: Aide Mémoire presented	October 2015
Draft CPE Report completed and circulated for comments	November 2015
Final CPE Report circulated for Management Response	January 2016
Final CPE Report presented at GEF Council meeting	June 2016

Annex A: CPE REPORT OUTLINE

The CPE report will be a concise, stand-alone document organized around the following general table of contents:

CHAPTER 1: Executive Summary

CHAPTER 2: Evaluation Framework

1. Background
2. Objectives and Scope
3. Methodology and Limitations

CHAPTER 3: Context

1. Country Description: Republic of Tajikistan
2. The Global Environmental Facility
3. Environmental Resources in GEF Focal Areas
4. Tajikistan Environmental Legal, Policy and Institutional Framework

CHAPTER 4: The GEF Portfolio in Tajikistan

1. Defining the GEF Portfolio
2. Composition and Evolution of the GEF Portfolio
3. The GEF Focal Point Mechanism in Tajikistan

CHAPTER 5: Results, Effectiveness and Sustainability

1. Results by Focal Area
2. Broader Adoption
3. Knowledge Generation
4. Gender

CHAPTER 6: Relevance

1. Relevance to Achieving Global Environmental Benefits
2. Relevance to Tajikistan's Sustainable Development Agenda and Environmental Priorities
3. Relevance to National Action Plans within GEF Focal Areas
4. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

CHAPTER 7: Efficiency

1. Time, Effort, and Financial Resources Required for Project Design and Implementation
2. Coordination and Synergies
3. Monitoring and Evaluation

Chapter 8: Main Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Conclusions
 - a. Results, Effectiveness and Sustainability
 - b. Relevance
 - c. Efficiency
2. Recommendations

ANNEXES

- A. Country Response
- B. Quality Assurance Statement
- C. Country-Specific Terms of Reference
- D. Interviewees and Workshops Participants
- E. Sites Visited
- F. GEF Portfolio in Tajikistan
- G. Bibliography

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS

Country Environmental Legal Framework
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
Progress toward Impact – Case Studies

Annex B: EVALUATION MATRIX

Key question	Indicators/ Basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
Effectiveness, Results and Sustainability			
a) To what extent has GEF support to Tajikistan been effective in producing results by focal area at the project as well as at the aggregate level (program and country portfolio)?	Project level outcomes and impacts	- Project staffs and beneficiaries - National and local government representatives	- Focus groups and individual interviews - Online consultation platform
	Aggregate level outcomes and impacts	- Case studies	- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- Project staffs and beneficiaries - National, local government representatives	- Focus groups and individual interviews - Field visits
		- Case studies - Remote sensing data (if applicable)	- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- Country, regional, thematic evaluations - Project implementation reports (PIRs) - Mid-Term Evaluations (MTEs) - Terminal evaluations (TEs) - TE reviews (TERs)	- Desk review - Meta-analysis of larger evaluations - GEF portfolio aggregate analysis
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (i.e., self-ratings and independent ratings)	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS)	- Desk review - Project Review Protocols
b) To what extent has GEF support led to progress toward impact through broader adoption mechanisms over an extended period of time after completion?	Changes in global benefit indexes and other global environmental indicators	- Evidence from non-GEF projects and donors - Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	- Literature review - Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
	Evidence/examples of broader adoption (sustaining, replication, scaling-up, mainstreaming and market change mechanisms in place)	- Project evaluations (TEs, TERs) - Data from overall projects and other donors	- Desk review - Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
		- Case studies - Remote sensing data (if applicable)	- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- Project staffs and beneficiaries - National, local government representatives	- Focus groups and individual interviews - Online consultation platform
		- Data from overall projects and other donors	- Desk review - Meta-analysis of evaluation reports

Key question	Indicators/ Basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
	Project sustainability ratings	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs)	- Desk review
	Examples of individual and Institutional capacity developed	- NGO staff	- Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
	Availability of financial and economic resources	- Project staff and beneficiaries	- Focus groups and individual interviews
	Status of environmental legal and institutional framework	- National and local government representatives	- Project Review Protocols
		- Case studies	- GEF portfolio analysis
			- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- Country Environmental Legal Framework	- Literature review
			- Timeline analysis
c) To what extent has GEF support been effective in sustaining the knowledge generated and shared by GEF projects with partners in Tajikistan (national stakeholders and GEF Agencies) and partners outside of the country?	Project M&E Ratings	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs)	- Desk review
			- Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
	# and quality of knowledge products	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs)	- Desk review
	Language of KM product(s)	- Case studies	- Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
	# lessons incorporated into new GEF and other initiatives	- Project staffs and beneficiaries	- Focus groups and individual interviews
	Evidence of institutional capacity created for knowledge generation and sharing	- National, local government representatives	- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- National, international information/data repositories	- GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
	Evidence/examples for KM products and practices contributing to broader adoption (sustaining, replication, scaling-up, mainstreaming and market change mechanisms)	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs)	- Desk review
		- Case studies	- Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
		- Project staffs and beneficiaries	- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- National and local government representatives	- Focus groups and individual interviews
		- National and international information/data repositories	- Online consultation platform
	Evidence of mechanisms and channels set up for knowledge generation and sharing	- NGO staff	- Focus groups and individual interviews
		- Project staff and beneficiaries	- Online consultation platform
		- National, local government representatives	
d) To what extent has GEF support to Tajikistan been effective making a contribution to chemicals issues, specifically reduction of	Project outcomes and impacts on ODS and POPs chemical reduction.	- Project-related reviews (PIRs, TEs, TERs, etc.)	- Individual interview and focus groups
	Evidence of knowledge products and practices for	- Case studies	- Desk review
		- Project staffs and beneficiaries	- Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
		- National, local government representatives	- Progress towards Impact methodology
		- National, international information/data	- GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis

Key question	Indicators/ Basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
POPs?	generating awareness about chemical issues	repositories	
e) To what extent has GEF support contributed to reducing gender inequality and promoting women’s empowerment?	Project outcomes and impacts on gender empowerment/equality	- Project reviews (PIRs, TEs, TERs, etc.) - Case studies - NGO staff, project staff and beneficiaries - National, local government representatives - Information on national progress in reducing gender inequalities.	- Desk review - Focus groups and individual interviews - GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
	Number of projects considering gender empowerment/equality as specific result at the design as well as the implementation stage		
Relevance			
a) Has GEF support to Tajikistan been relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits in the climate change, biodiversity, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?	Degree of alignment of GEF support and results with global environmental indicators in GEF focal areas	- National Conventions action plans - RAF and STAR Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity, climate change, land degradation) - Global environmental indicators (LD, IW, ODS, etc.)	- Desk review - Project field visits - Project Review Protocols
		- Country Environmental Legal Framework	- Literature review - Timelines and historical causality
	Degree of alignment of GEF support and results with focal area objectives	- GEF Phases’ Focal Area Strategies - GEF website	- Desk review
	Degree of alignment of GEF support and results with national targets and commitments under conventions and multilateral environmental agreements	- Convention documents and websites - National reports and communications to conventions	- Desk review - GEF portfolio analysis (by focal area, agency, modality and project status)
- Project documentation (project document, PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - PMIS - Agency project databases			

Key question	Indicators/ Basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
		- Government officials - Agency staff - Donor and civil society representatives	- Stakeholder consultation - Focus groups and individual interviews
		- Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	- Literature review
b) Has GEF support to Tajikistan been relevant to the Tajik environmental priorities and sustainable development needs and challenges?	Degree of alignment of GEF support and results to the national sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities	- National sustainable development and environmental policies and strategies - Project-related documentation (Project documents, MTEs, TEs, TERs, etc.) - PMIS - Agency project databases	- Desk review - Online consultation platform - GEF portfolio analysis (by focal area, agency, modality and project status)
		- Country Environmental Legal Framework	- Literature review - Timelines analysis
	Level of GEF funding compared to other national and/or international funding for the environmental sector in Tajikistan	- International databases (e.g. WB, OECD) - National databases (Dept. of Statistics, etc.) - GEF project documents, TEs, and TERs - GEF portfolio	- Literature review
	Evidence of involvement of stakeholders in project formulation, implementation	- Government representatives - Agency staff - Donor and civil society representatives	- Focus groups and individual interviews
	Overall degree of country ownership	- Country ownership assessment	- Country Ownership and Driven-ness Guidance Tool and Templates
	Evidence of GEF supporting development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building)	- National sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and action plans - PMIS	- Desk review - GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, agency, modality and project status (national)
	Evidence of sustainable livelihoods created	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - Case studies	- Desk review - Interviews and focus groups
	Evidence of individual and collective capacity strengthened	- Project staffs and beneficiaries - National, local government representatives - National, international information/data	- GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis

Key question	Indicators/ Basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
	Evidence of increased resilience and reduction in environmental vulnerability	repositories	
	Comparative advantage of GEF support as compared with other sources of environmental finance in the country	- GEF Enabling Activity reports and products (e.g. NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, National reports to UN Conventions, etc.)	- Desk review - Online consultation platform
		- Government officials - National statistics - Agency staff - Donor and civil society representatives	- Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
c) To what extent have the GEF and its Agencies been supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making processes in Tajikistan?	Changes in degree of country ownership over time	- Country ownership assessment	- Desk review - Interviews
	Examples of new decision making mechanisms and resulting decisions	- Project documentation (Project documents, PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - PMIS - Agency project databases	- Desk review
	Examples of movement of national/local efforts towards sustainable development activities	- GEF Secretariat and Agency technical staff	- Interviews
		- Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	- Literature review
		- Country Environmental Legal Framework	- Timelines analysis
Efficiency			
a) How much time, effort and financial resources (including co-financing) did it take to formulate and implement projects in Tajikistan, according to GEF support modality?	Process indicators: (project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of GEF support modality	- Project documentation (Project Documents, PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - PMIS - Agency project databases	- Desk review - Portfolio analysis - Timelines
	Number of dropped, cancelled and/or rejected projects	- GEF Secretariat, Agency and govt. staff - PMIS - GEF portfolio	- Interviews and field visits - Project Review Protocols
	GEF financing vs. co-financing	- PMIS and project documents	
b) What have been and are the roles, types of engagement, coordination and synergies	Level of participation from various stakeholders in GEF-related fora	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - Meeting minutes	- Desk review - Meta-analysis of evaluation reports

Key question	Indicators/ Basic data	Sources of information	Methodology
among different stakeholders in project implementation in Tajikistan?	Roles and responsibilities of GEF national actors Types and quality of coordination between GEF projects and with other donors Existence of a national GEF coordination mechanism	- Project staff - Government representatives - GEF Secretariat and Agency technical staff	- Focus groups and interviews - Field visits - Institutional analysis - Online consultation platform
c) Have there been and are there synergies between: i) GEF Agencies in GEF programming and implementation; ii) national institutions for GEF support; and iii) GEF and other donor support in Tajikistan?	Evidence of interaction and cooperation between actors Evidence of effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations Examples of complementarity of GEF support	- Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - Meeting minutes - GEF Agency staff - National executing agencies - Project staff - National, local government officials - NGO staff and donor representatives - Evaluations of non GEF environmental projects	- Desk review - Meta-analysis of evaluation reports - Interviews and field visits - Online consultation platform - Meta-analysis of evaluation reports
d) What role did Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play – both at design and implementation – in project adaptive management and overall efficiency in Tajikistan?	Project results frameworks feeding into higher than project level results according to national strategies Evidence of use of M&E information to improve project management and performance GEF Tracking Tools correctly filled and used Evidence of lessons learnt incorporated into future initiatives M&E Ratings	- Project documents (results frameworks and logframes) - National strategies - Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - GEF Agency staff and GEF focal points - GEF Tracking Tools - Project reviews (PIRs, MTEs, TEs, TERs) - Policy makers/government officials - GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff	- Desk review - GEF portfolio analysis - Interviews - Online consultation platform - Desk review - Interviews - Online consultation platform