

Call-down Contract
Mid-term evaluation of the Growth in the Rural Economy and Agriculture:
Tajikistan (GREAT)

Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

1.1 The British Government represented through UKaid and the German Government represented through the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) decided to co-finance the on-going Framework and Finance for Private Sector Development Programme in Tajikistan (FFPSD). The implementing partner is GIZ. The Growth in the Rural Economy and Agriculture Tajikistan Project (GREAT) is an integral part of the FFPSD. UKaid and GIZ decided to pursue another co-financing arrangement as the previous co-financing for the Rural Growth Programme (RGP) and the Sustainable Economic Development (SED) produced substantial impact and provided useful insights in how effective development support can be provided in Tajikistan. Between September 2012 and March 2015, DFID will contribute £13,200,000 (£13m project and up to £200,000 for evaluation) out of a total GREAT budget of about £20,000,000. BMZ will provide the remaining £7,000,000.

1.2 The overall objective of the Growth in the Rural Economy and Agriculture Tajikistan (GREAT) programme is to reduce poverty through increased economic growth in rural areas and to do so in an inclusive manner. Inclusive rural economic growth will be achieved by providing direct support to farmers and rural entrepreneurs at a time of agrarian reform, by improving the business enabling environment, by widening access to micro-finance, and from increased revenues from cross-border trade. The outcome indicators used are the value of private investments in rural areas; the value of agricultural and non-agricultural value chains and changes in household assets. GREAT plans to achieve this outcome:

- through improvements in the business enabling environment;
- by supporting private sector-led approach to providing farmers with access to agricultural inputs, technologies, advice and markets. GREAT will adopt a

value chain approach to linking the producer to primary markets, to processors and to the consumer;

- by improving access to financial products; and
- by enhancing revenues from cross-border and transport corridor economic activities

1.3 The benefits of GREAT cannot be measured solely in financial terms over the life of the project. The challenge is to ensure that agrarian reform delivers long-term benefits by providing the opportunity to improve the lives of hundreds of thousands of farming families in a sustainable way. GREAT will address these longer-term issues by supporting the formulation and implementation of policies to improve the enabling environment for business and financial services, by the expansion of cross-border trade, by the strengthening of civil society; and through improvements in the management of common property pasture resources. The social, environmental and other non-quantifiable benefits of GREAT are highest in upland areas, underpinning the case for a geographically and socially inclusive approach.

1.4 GREAT supports the strategic priorities of growth in DFID's by contributing to job creation and improving the population's access to finance. It directly contributes to DFID's three pillars of support for Central Asia; private sector and growth, promoting democracy and good governance; and regional trade, growth and cooperation. GREAT directly seeks to promote private sector-led economic growth and regional trade. By supporting better implementation of Government policies and empowering the private sector, it will also indirectly improve governance and accountability.

1.5 GREAT has been operating since late 2012 and has been managed since that time by GIZ contracted to DFID and BMZ. **These Terms of Reference (TOR) lay out the requirement for an independent evaluation of the GREAT for the period January 2013 March 2015.** DFID, in consultation with an evaluation steering committee, will, through these terms of reference, appoint an Evaluation Provider¹ who will work with the GIZ team to design and implement an independent evaluation

¹ The term "Supplier" or "Evaluation Provider" is used throughout this TOR to represent the company, NGO, or group of companies/ NGOs/individuals who might want to bid for this contract. Bids can be made by single organisations or partnerships. Partnerships that include Tajik organisations in key roles are actively encouraged to compete.

framework that will assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme and its achievement of wider impact.

2. Purpose and Objectives

Objectives

2.1 DFID wishes to invite suitably qualified organisations to implement a robust independent evaluation of the Growth in the Rural Economy and Agriculture: Tajikistan programme (GREAT). The purpose of the independent evaluation is to assess the effectiveness (outputs to outcomes) of the programme, and its achievement of impact and the efficiency (inputs to outputs) of the implementing partner's management structure in delivering the programme. The evaluation will cover the first phase of the programme. The programme is likely to be extended for up to five years. The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to *assess the performance of the GREAT programme over the period 2013-2015 to make recommendations for its next phase and allow for preparation of the final evaluation*. GREAT's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and expected impacts and sustainability (through the review of the monitoring system and the preparation for the final evaluation) will be assessed as part of this evaluation.

2.2 The evaluation will cover all activities carried out by GIZ under the GREAT/FFPSD programme for the period January 2013 March 2015 and the extent to which the project contributed to inclusive economic growth in targeted areas. It will assess the efficiency with which outputs have been/ are being achieved, and their relevance to the overall aim of promoting local and rural development. Particular emphasis will also be placed on evaluating the extent to which links were achieved with national development strategies, as well as synergies with the development priorities identified and pursued by the Tajikistan Development Coordination Council (DCC).

2.3 The evaluation is being conducted at the request of the BMZ and DFID in order to collect and analyse evidence on the impact of the GREAT project on inclusive economic growth in targeted rural areas. More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the relevance, implementation efficiency, impact and sustainability of activities undertaken. The evaluation will highlight possibilities for replication and scaling-up.

The lessons learned will also be used to inform the next phase of the programme as well as the work of line ministries and other donors carrying out related projects. The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Programme partners but also circulated more broadly among BMZ, DFID and the donor community in Tajikistan.

Gender issues: The evaluation should explore the differential impact of GREAT on women compared to men including whether they are affected differently, access to benefits and barriers to this. To examine the effectiveness of this approach, systemic disaggregation of data, including by gender, age, geographical location and income status will be required.

2.4 Climate Change: FFPSD/GREAT is already actively promoting activities and products which increase climate change resilience, lower GHG emissions and have environmental benefits. The evaluation will include the relevance of the programme with regards to climate change adaptation related risks and opportunities

3. Target audiences

3.1 The Evaluation will be used by the DFID, GIZ/BMZ (the co-donor) to ensure that the next phase of the programme is providing the best possible impact on the growth of the rural economy and responding to the needs of rural women and men.

Evidence from the evaluation will also be used by government and donors to inform the development and implementation of future programming and government policy on growth in the rural economy as well as agro-businesses. The target audiences for the products provided by the Evaluation Provider will include but not be limited to:

- GREAT Steering Committee, including MoEDT, MoA and regional representatives of the government;
- DFID livelihood and Private Sector Development teams members;
- GIZ/BMZ teams (co-donor and implementing partner);
- The Donor group for Agriculture and Private Sector Development.

4. Recipient

4.1 The main recipients of the services are the Government of Tajikistan mainly: Ministry of economic development and trade and Ministry of agriculture as well as DFID Central Asia and BMZ. Reports will also be made available to key donors and the main downstream partners as agreed with DFID Central Asia.

5. Scope

5.1 Evaluation design and methods should be proposed in bids and detailed in the Evaluation Inception Report. Wherever possible, the Final Evaluation should draw upon methods which allow a defensible attribution of outcomes and impacts to the programme's activities. The Final Evaluation will also seek to clarify why the outcomes achieved were delivered and the process of change that took place.

5.2 The evaluation methodology will explicitly include programme participants (local communities, farmers, etc.), ensuring feedback and inputs from data collection to dissemination throughout the process.

Data sources

In line with Paris Declaration principles, it is expected that the Evaluation Provider should take account of national M&E systems, and ensure new data collection is complementary to existing systems and data is made available to national stakeholders as far as possible.

The Evaluation Provider will have access to programme documents including annual reviews, ad hoc studies and M&E data.

Responsibility for data collection, analysis and reporting

5.3 Most of the data for monitoring the logical framework, particularly on outputs and outcomes, will be the responsibility of the implementing partner (GIZ). However, the evaluation team should review the monitoring data that has been gathered by the GIZ to ensure that it is robust, accurate and suitable for final evaluation purposes. Where required the Evaluation Provider should make recommendations to improve the quality of the data collected and propose complementary data collection measures where appropriate.

The Evaluation Provider will be specifically responsible for planning and managing data collection for the initial process evaluation. The follow-up data collection for the final evaluation and report will be contracted through a separate contract. The Evaluation Provider will be able to apply to this separate bid.

5.4 The independent evaluation will involve an inception document followed by an Implementation Phase that will consist of a field evaluation and recommendations for a final evaluation. Indicative details of these evaluation activities are shown below.

Evaluation workplan and outline:

5.5 The Evaluation Provider will develop a detailed plan for this mid-term evaluation of the programme, tied to and consistent with the work-plan for the implementation of GREAT. The workplan and outline will be presented in the Evaluation Steering committee before launching additional data collection and interviews. The outline should include the following aspects:

- Revisit and refine the theory of change as necessary
- Propose an evaluation design for the programme including recommended evaluation methods to be used, propose counterfactuals where appropriate, selection of the activities to be evaluated and data collection methods.
- Provide a communication and dissemination plan for the evaluation, including the intended process for engaging with and communicating findings to stakeholders at all levels.
- Define the resource requirements to implement the recommended evaluation design and methods, including plans for contracting data as appropriate and timeframes for its completion.

5.6 The Evaluation Provider will also provide recommendations on the M&E framework, to ensure data collection by GIZ for programme monitoring purposes will also be fit to inform the final evaluation. Recommendations should include, but are not limited to:

- Revision and validation of the Theory of Change;
- Identification of programme monitoring data required from
 - to meet evaluation needs and timings for this;
- Revision of logframe indicators, sources and timings;
- Discussion of the relative responsibilities for additional data collection and their coherence in the overall programme M&E framework;
- Recommendations regarding the overall data collection system;

5.7 During the inception phase the Evaluation Provider will begin to implement the activities required for a rigorous evaluation. This will include, where possible, identification of counterfactual groups for targeted evaluation of components, and planning for additional data collection to be undertaken following this evaluation

Mid-term Evaluation

5.8 It is anticipated that the Mid Term Evaluation will, amongst other things:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of each of the output and outcome areas;
- Make recommendations to improve the delivery of interventions;
- Ensure appropriate data gathering mechanisms and studies are in place for the Final Evaluation;

5.9 The Mid Term Evaluation should contribute to the Final Evaluation by including a review of the monitoring information available, the work on counterfactuals, the key themes and detailed evaluation questions, and making any necessary recommendations for refinement of programme implementation. The intended audience of the Initial Evaluation will be DFID, the Steering Committee and implementing stakeholders.

5.10 The Evaluation Provider will submit a report to DFID to summarise the evaluation process, to provide an assessment of the validity of the monitoring data, and to provide any further recommendations regarding lessons learnt, project performance or value for money to inform the annual review process.

5.11 Suggested evaluation questions for the initial evaluation are listed below in paragraph 4.21.

5.12 The initial evaluation will directly feed into the programme annual review, as well as delivering a second open report for stakeholders in government and the donor community summarising the key outcomes of GREAT and making recommendations for the next phase of the programme, both in terms of policy and approaches to supporting growth in the rural economy in Tajikistan.

Evaluation questions

5.13 Given the purpose of the evaluation – to measure the impact of the programme, understand why change has occurred and to learn from its implementation – the evaluation includes both impact and process questions. These questions are open to refinement and responses to this Terms of Reference should suggest alterations where appropriate and a plan for how the final evaluation questions will be agreed in consultation with stakeholders. The evaluation questions have been influenced by the OECD DAC evaluation principles.

5.14 The following are proposed questions that would be answered in the mid-term evaluation:

- Relevance*: are the activities supported through GREAT the right ones given the theory of change? Which are more or less relevant? What are the key elements/enabling factors of GREAT components that have contributed to, or detracted from achieving successful outcomes?

Impact: What were the outcomes and (where possible) the impacts of the different interventions as regards different participants – male/female farmers? Was there a differential impact of GREAT on women compared to men including whether they are affected differently, access to benefits and barriers to this? Were there any unintended outcomes and impacts? What has been the wider effect of the value chains? What has been the wider effect on the rural economy? What is the impact outside of the intervention villages? Is there evidence of spill over effects and demonstration effects that point to wider rural transformation of value chains and modes of production?

Coherence: how do the different activities come together and complement each other? Where are there gaps and overlaps in support by others?

Coverage: has the targeting been appropriate? Who is and is not successfully being reached by the programme, including whether there is a difference in reach for men and women?

Effectiveness: how effective is the programme's governance, reporting and planning processes? Where are there blockages or confusion? Has anybody been harmed? Have there been any unintended outcomes? Is the grant mechanism and grant levels being set effectively to maximise leverage of private sector investment? How effective have the selected activities been at achieving short-term outcomes? How effective were the interventions in delivering their intended outputs and outcomes for the intended objectives relative to the counterfactual (increasing agricultural growth, increasing incomes and jobs)?

Efficiency: to what extent were programme activities completed on time and on budget? What are the barriers to the implementation of interventions? How did external/internal factors influence delivery of interventions? To what extent do the programme and its interventions deliver value for money? How could value for money be improved in the programme and costs contained without affecting delivery?

Coordination: how coordinated is GREAT, particularly with regard to similar development activities? What are the barriers to a coordinated approach?

Sustainability: Will the changes achieved by the programme be sustained? What factors are expected to influence the continuation of programme benefits after the end of this funding phase? Can a scaled up programme deliver wider rural economic transformation, and what are the key considerations for programme expansion?

6. Requirements

6.3 The evaluation must be carried out by researchers with a recognised reputation and practical experience of rigorous impact evaluation. The evaluation must reflect the local context. It must be independent, robust and credible.

6.4 All findings, datasets and methods for the evaluation must be published within a reasonable time period and made available to allow researchers to replicate findings. Publication in peer reviewed journals should be an objective.

6.5 DFID will have unlimited access to all material produced under the contract.

The Evaluation Provider will need to field a gender balanced team of experts that combine expertise in:

- Evaluation of complex, multi-component development programmes using quantitative and qualitative methods;
- Evaluating multi-disciplinary rural development programmes; experience of evaluations in the specific programme intervention areas (private sector development, micro-finance) is essential;
- Evaluations in Central Asia or CIS countries and a demonstrated understanding of political economy issues in the region;
- Generating data to demonstrate programme effects for different segments of the population (i.e. women vs men, farmers and other off-farm and non-farm actors along the value chains such as local suppliers and contractors, etc.), and multiplier effects (i.e. indirect impacts of agricultural growth on other sectors of the rural economy and along agricultural supply chains);
- Extensive experience of DFID log frames and theories of change would be desirable.
- Opportunities for engaging and building up Tajik research capacity should be maximised.

7. Outputs

7.1: The Evaluation should produce:

- An evaluation **work-plan** for the three month evaluation exercise to be submitted to DFID and signed off by the Steering Committee three weeks from the beginning of the evaluation phase in country.
- A five-page **Evaluation Inception briefing** that sets out the monitoring and evaluation framework and the plan for the evaluation of the programme, including a communication and dissemination plan. The inception report will be due three weeks after the start of the evaluation.
- **A final evaluation report**, presenting summative findings answering the evaluation questions posed, and containing an executive summary and recommendations. All findings will be disaggregated where possible to allow analysis of findings for different groups, including different beneficiary groups,

gender etc. Disaggregated datasets should be made available either online or in an annex to the report but to be agreed with DFID. The timing of the final wave of data collection and the evaluation report will be agreed in the evaluation plan. This may be at the end or after the end of the programme.

- An accessible **communication tool**, to inform policy makers (this may include a presentation workshop for government partners, civil society and other donors).
- A **summary** of the Final Evaluation and **dissemination plan** to ensure the findings reach the intended audiences. The summary will be translated in Russian
- An updated Annual Review format (AR) based on the evaluation findings. A preliminary, desk-based Annual review will have been carried out in November 2014 and will be complimented during the mid-term evaluation.

Final Evaluation

The follow-up evaluation will be contracted out separately and the outputs required will be detailed in a separate Terms of Reference.

7. Constraints and Dependencies

7.1 As mentioned earlier, the evaluation team will need to work closely with DFID Central Asia, BMZ and GIZ. In undertaking their work the Evaluation Provider will also be expected to engage closely with the following stakeholders:

- DFID Central Asia Livelihoods and PSD teams;
- GIZ team and downstream partners
- Key donors in the field of rural growth: EU, EBRD, WB, IFC, KfW;
- GREAT Steering Committee;
- Technical Working Groups as appropriate;
- Ministry of Economic Development and Trade; Ministry of Agriculture;
- Provincial Stakeholders including local authorities, civil society organisations, micro-finance institutions, women's groups and producer organisations;
- Other donors and programme providers in the rural growth sector.

7.2 Potential evaluation risks include:

Risk	Probability	Impact	Mitigation
Data collection not possible due to security risks or natural hazards.	Low	High	Evaluation provider to develop strategy to manage data collection and security risks and natural hazards (including weather related hazards). Consideration to be given to using local data collectors.
Insufficient reliable data from programme M&E and data from relevant ministries and government agencies. Reliable data is not available either because it does not exist or because it is not made available for use.	Medium	High	Evaluation provider to review data quality and availability of data for the design of the evaluation methodology Clearly identify gaps and additional data collection in inception workplan and outline.
Findings not aligned with political interests	Low	Medium	Regular communication with key stakeholders will ensure they are engaged with the evaluation and its findings. DFID will ensure that positive or negative results are understood and accepted as a relevant contribution to the evidence-base.

8. Timeframe

8.1 The independent evaluation will be designed for a three-month period, to allow for assessment of sustainability of GREAT's impacts. The intended starting date for the evaluation exercise would be April 2015

8.2 Detailed timescales for the required deliverables are in the outputs section (paragraphs 6.1-6.3).

9. DFID Co-ordination

9.1 The DFID Central Asia Rural Growth Advisor and the Programme Manager will be the direct point of contact in DFID for the independent evaluation, and will arrange Steering Group meetings.

10. Background

Politically and economically, Tajikistan still carries the legacy of the Soviet era and the Civil War of the 1990s. Political institutions are weak. The economy is based on a few export commodities – aluminium and cotton - and the inflow of remittances from migrant labour.

Agriculture contributes about one quarter of GDP and employs about half of the country's labour force, almost two-thirds of whom are women. Two thirds of the 47% of the population who live below the poverty line are in rural areas. The incidence of poverty is greatest in upland and other less developed regions. Women are socially and economically disadvantaged with poverty disproportionately prevalent in female-headed households, including women abandoned by husbands who have migrated. With strong donor encouragement, the Government is making progress on agrarian and agriculture sector reform. Land redistribution and the transfer of assets as part of the agrarian reform process provide a one-off opportunity for hundreds of thousands of poor rural households to benefit from market-based economic growth. If this opportunity is not grasped, there is a danger that the benefits will be captured by powerful groups.

The overall picture with agriculture sector reform is one of progress at a policy level not always being carried through to implementation by weak institutions. Similarly,

although the enabling environment for the private sector in Tajikistan is improving, it remains poor. All too often there is reluctance by local government officials to implement policies and regulations.

Taking advantage of the economic and social opportunities offered by agrarian and agriculture sector reform will require more diversified agricultural production, increased agricultural productivity with value chain development and expansion of economic growth beyond the agriculture sector. Such broad-based and inclusive growth can only come from the private sector. It will require an enabling environment supportive of small and medium-sized enterprises, including Government commitment to implementing the policies and strategies developed over the past few years. Constraints that must be addressed include the statist, top-down approach of many local Government officials; an onerous business regulatory framework; uncertain security of ownership or tenure of land; limited access to investment finance; poor quality advice; limited access to technologies and markets and obstacles to cross-border trade.

DFID, through the Rural Growth (RGP) and Sustainable Economic Development (SED) projects, has promoted agrarian and agriculture sector reform as well as improvements in the business enabling environment. DFID's engagement both with central policy formulation and with the implementation of those policies by local government gives it an almost unique insight on progress. DFID will ensure that the evidence from RGP and SED are incorporated in future programmes. Most importantly, DFID support will ensure that wealth creation through rural economic growth is inclusive; providing opportunities for poorer upland communities and female-headed households as well as for the beneficiaries of agrarian reform in the high potential lowlands.

Environmental and Climate Change Context. With more than half of its territory situated above 3,000 meters, and located within a zone at high risk of earthquakes, Tajikistan is particularly vulnerable to natural disasters. In 2010, the ratings agency Maplecroft placed Tajikistan 10th in the global list of countries ranked most at risk

from experiencing economic losses resulting from natural disasters². Tajikistan is expected to experience a wide range of climatic changes which will vary depending upon the geographical region and season. The programme will address some of the poor land management practices leading to land degradation and greater sensitivity to climate change.

Many of Tajikistan's environment problems stem from the agricultural policies of the Soviet era which converted vast tracts of arid and semi- arid land to cotton cultivation, in a region which receives very little rainfall and experiences high temperatures in the cotton growing season. Chemical use in agriculture was widespread in soviet agriculture, and continued after independence, Although there is a limit to what GREAT can do in terms of improving the extensive network of dilapidated irrigation and drainage infrastructure in Tajikistan, the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) system is working with farmers to advise on improved on-field water management. GREAT will work with farmers on irrigated land to try and improve water efficiency where possible and, with rain-fed farmers in particular, on water conservation technologies. GREAT will also seek new opportunities to increase resilience to climate change.

11. Performance Requirements

11.1 The evaluation approach should be in line with DFID's evaluation policy and the OECD DAC evaluation principles. DFID also has its own evaluation research ethics principles and guidelines that are attached. OECD DAC guidelines on evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities suggests a range of tools for achieving conflict sensitivity in evaluation design and delivery. The Evaluation Provider will be expected to use these guidelines and to explain in all its evaluation reports, including in the evaluation framework, what measures will be taken and which measures were or were not taken to ensure the conflict sensitivity of the evaluation. A DFID practice paper on monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity is also attached for information purposes.

²Maplecroft, 2010. Natural Disasters Economic Losses Index.
http://maplecroft.com/about/news/economic_losses.html

11.2 DFID Evaluation Advisor for Central Asia will quality assure reports and at a minimum the Inception Report and Final Evaluation Report need to be signed off by DFID's Specialist Evaluation Quality Assurance Service (SEQAS).

11.3 Key Performance Indicators

The performance of the evaluation team will be managed through a schedule of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The KPIs will be agreed during the inception period and the schedule will form part of the Inception Report. Indicative general KPIs can be found in Appendix 7. The final schedule of KPIs agreed in the inception report will be far more specific to this evaluation.

12. Budget

12.1 The budget for this work is in the region of £150,000- £180,000.

13. Security and Duty of Care (DoC)

13.1 Under these terms of reference the contractor will be totally responsible for their staff's (and any third parties involved) duty of care, including for security, transport and accommodation during the assignment in Tajikistan. Arrangements for these should be provided with the bid documents. The supplier will need to be able to travel to and work in various locations. Further information for the expected DoC requirements are provided below and see the attached Annex A and B.

13.2 The Service Provider is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above. Where the Service Provider provides personnel in-country who are based abroad, travel advice is also available on the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) website and the Service Provider must ensure they (and their Personnel) are up to date with the latest position.

13.3 The Service Provider must develop their proposal on the basis of being fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above and the initial risk assessment matrix developed by DFID (see Annex A). They must confirm in their Tender that:

- They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- They understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
- They have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.

13.4 Acceptance of responsibility must be supported with evidence of capability and DFID reserves the right to clarify any aspect of this evidence. In providing evidence Tenderers should consider the following questions:

- Have you completed an initial assessment of potential risks that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding, and are you satisfied that you understand the risk management implications (not solely relying on information provided by DFID)?
- Have you prepared an outline plan that you consider appropriate to manage these risks at this stage (or will you do so if you are awarded the contract) and are you confident/comfortable that you can implement this effectively?
- Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff are appropriately trained (including specialist training where required) before they are deployed and will you ensure that on-going training is provided where necessary?
- Have you an appropriate mechanism in place to monitor risk on a live / on-going basis (or will you put one in place if you are awarded the contract)?
- Have you ensured or will you ensure that your staff are provided with and have access to suitable equipment and will you ensure that this is reviewed and provided on an on-going basis?
- Have you appropriate systems in place to manage an emergency / incident if one arises?

13.5 DFID Overall Project/Intervention

Summary Risk Assessment Matrix

Project/Intervention title: Growth in rural economy and agriculture in Tajikistan (GREAT)

Location: Tajikistan

Date of Assessment: November, 2014

Assessing official: [Redacted]

Theme	DFID Risk Score
OVERALL RATING³	Average score is 1.7 (low risk)
FCO travel advice	2 Tajikistan 4 GBAO
Host nation travel advice	1 Tajikistan 4 GBAO
Transportation	3
Security	2
Civil Unrest	2
Violence/crime	1
Terrorism	1
War	1
Hurricane	1
Earthquake	3
Flood	2 All year except 3 April May
Medical Services	3 Dushanbe 4 Rural areas
Nature of Project/Intervention	3

1 Very Low risk	2 Low risk	3 Med risk	4 High risk	5 Very High risk
Low		Medium	High Risk	

14. Appendix

14.1 The following appendix are provided:

1. DFID's Ethics Principles for Evaluation.
2. GREAT Theory of Change
3. GREAT Logframe
4. Inception Report, FFPSP/GREAT, January 2013
5. Joint Annual Review GREAT, GIZ/DFID, January 2014
6. DFID Standard Key Performance Indicators

³ The Overall Risk rating is calculated using the MODE function which determines the most frequently occurring value.