



**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
TERMS OF REFERENCE/SERVICE CONTRACT**

I. Job Information

Job title:	National Consultant/Evaluator for Evaluation of UN JP "Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley"
Type:	Individual Contract
Project Title/Department:	Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley / EGC/ UNDP Uzbekistan
Duration of the service:	59 working/days during November 22, 2021 - February 28, 2022
Work status (full time /part time):	Part time
Duty station:	Tashkent
Expected travel site:	Andijan, Namangan and Fergana regions
Reports To:	Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP in Uzbekistan

II. Background and context

In partnership with UNODC and UNESCO, UNDP launched a new project entitled "Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley" in January 2020, intending to support communities to better adapt to the rapid reform process Uzbekistan while enabling local service providers to deliver the reform agenda inclusively. This project focuses on young people as a fast-growing demographic and the future of the country and aims to ensure that they are not left behind in the context of the rapid changes linked to the reform process. In practical terms, the project aims to ensure that young women and young men continue to have equitable access to socio-economic opportunities and benefit from its positive outcomes while enabling them to have a stronger say about their future. The project has supported community resilience and sustained peace by empowering youth as actors of positive change, increasing their opportunities for self-fulfillment, and piloting new models for the government to deliver reform and services inclusively in the Fergana Valley. The project aimed to provide timely support to the implementation of the country's youth policy and to be innovative by introducing for the first time life skills and civic engagement as catalysts for sustainable development and peace in Uzbekistan. UNDP is the lead agency for the project. UNDP is responsible for the overall coordination of the activities, organizing efficient processes, and evaluating the project.

The leading partner on the project is the Youth Affairs Agency of Uzbekistan. The main stakeholders included Presidential Administration, Institute for Strategic and Inter-Regional Studies, and line ministries for each output.

For output 1 – Presidential Administration, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Public Education, Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations, Ministry of Economic Development and Poverty Reduction, Youth Union and local government;

For output 2 – Youth Affairs Agency, Development Strategy Center, NGO "Yuksalish", Ministry of Support to Makhalla and Family, National Volunteer Association, State TV and Radio Company, National Association of Electronic Mass Media (NAESMI);

For output 3 – Ministry of Public Education, Ministry of Support to Makhalla and Family, Local governments, Academy for Public Administration, General Prosecutor's Office, including Academy for Prosecutors;

For output 4 – Ministry of Interior, including local police departments and probation services, General Prosecutor's Office including Academy for Prosecutors, Ministry of Justice, Chamber of Advocates.

The project envisages that young people will be empowered to act as actors of positive change and have the mechanisms to participate equally in political, economic, and social life, and duty bearers will have the necessary approaches and skills to ensure inclusive service delivery and to engage with youth as changemakers, thereby strengthening vertical and horizontal trust and building community

resilience in a period of political and economic transformation. The outcome as mentioned above will be delivered through the following outputs:

Output 1.1. Young people are equipped with knowledge and skills that foster their civic participation and socio-economic inclusion;

Output 1.2. Young people are provided with opportunities to constructively participate in decision making, socio-political life and act as key agents of change;

Output 1.3. The capacity of local administrators and educators to implement government policies and ensure inclusive public service delivery is improved;

Output 1.4. Duty bearers have the skills and approaches necessary to address the needs of vulnerable youth based on the rule of law and a fair and humane justice system.

Initially, the project was 18 months (commenced on 31.01.2020), and it was extended up to 6 months (it is expected to be completed on 31.12.2021) with a total budget of USD 2,199,369.56 funded by the UN Peacebuilding Fund.

The young women and men in the Fergana Valley face distinct political, social and economic challenges that may be impacted by reforms. The Fergana Valley is shared between Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, across a boundary that is not fully demarcated and often features densely populated and multi-ethnic settlements. The valley has witnessed disputes across communities and countries and faced challenges emanating from violent extremist groups that emerged in the immediate post-independence period.

The most considerable portion of the valley falls under Uzbekistan's territory, which is divided into the Andijan, Fergana, and Namangan regions. It has the highest population density in Uzbekistan, surpassing the country average of 71.5 people per square kilometer (i.e., Andijan has 689 people/km², Fergana 527.3 people/km² and Namangan 356.5 people/km²). 28.6 percent of the total population of Uzbekistan live in the valley, with 11.1% living in Fergana, 9.2% living in Andijan, and 8.3% living in Namangan.

Andijan, Namangan, and Fergana reflect the average national age (28.8 national, 28.9, 28.5, and 29.4 respectively in the three regions). In Fergana and Namangan especially, the average age at the time of first marriage for both men and women is very low.

Against its highly productive agricultural land and relatively high level of industrial development compared to the rest of Uzbekistan, the Fergana Valley region features numerous demographic and economic challenges. As displayed in Table 1 below, compared to the country average, Fergana, Andijan, and Namangan are among the lowest-performing regions in terms of average income and average wages, and also with the lowest growth rate in terms of average nominal wages, suggesting that the gap with the rest of the country will continue to widen if this trend continues.

According to World Bank estimates, Fergana Valley is also one of the main areas of origin for outgoing labour migrants, with the share of migrants in total population standing at 4.6% in Andijan, 3% at Fergana, and 2.8% in Namangan, respectively. Subsequently, remittances make up 18.4% of total comprehensive income in Andijan, 15% in Namangan, and 13.5% in Fergana.

Featuring a very densely populated and young society facing considerable socio-economic challenges and a history of societal disputes, the communities in Fergana Valley, therefore, face a set of vulnerabilities that prioritize the valley for engagement.

Given the rapid political, economic and social transformation Uzbekistan is experiencing and the opportunities and risks associated with it, the project is extremely timely. It aims to capitalize on a narrow window of opportunity to move towards a more inclusive government and economic structure. The catalytic effect of the proposed PBF intervention would be to add on top of ongoing projects by the international community, notably the World Bank and the European Union, that mostly focus on capacity and infrastructure building, by focusing on dialogue and civic engagement skills and establishing meaningful platforms for dialogue and community engagement among youth and local administrations in the midst of rapid social, economic and political transformation brought forth by the reforms. This component is an essential gap in the increasing official initiatives as well, which are presented with limited engagement with the community. Furthermore, Fergana Valley offers significant opportunities for scalability, whereby successes in the valley can be replicated in other regions of Uzbekistan, as well as across the borders in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan that also share parts of the valley and are faced with similar challenges. The project is innovative, as it aims to

prioritize fostering social, economic and political inclusion in support of the reform agenda, with a particular focus on young people.

COVID-19 related note:

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly slowed or contracted economic growth for most countries globally and halted, or in some cases significantly reversed, progress on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Uzbekistan's GDP growth in 2020 was suboptimal and poverty levels increased for the first time in two decades as a result of the impact of the COVID-19 crisis.

The project beneficiaries are communities living in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan regions, which are located in the Fergana region. COVID-19 lockdown impacts their income generation activities due to the strict requirements aimed at mitigation of the pandemic impacts. As it is already recognized by the Government, COVID19 impacts result in increased unemployment and poverty, decrease of economic development paces and increased demand for social protection needs as well as health protection and urgent pandemic response measures. In this regard, the project had to make changes and adapt to the situation relevant to COVID-19 by changing the mode of interventions and rescheduling activities envisaging mass gatherings since it became important to avoid and mitigate the COVID19 adverse impacts on youth residing in the Fergana valley. To some extent the quarantine measures implemented during a year had a negative influence on the achievement of set goals and attaining gender marker score. The field surveys within activities of the project have been rescheduled from 2020 to 2021 due to quarantine measures and administrative requirements. Also, due to the COVID-19 restrictions, schools' closures and sanitary precautions in the schools affected the timely execution of the project activities related to the training of teachers and piloting the programmes in the schools.

As of March 11 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country was restricted from March 25 2020 and travel within the country was also restricted. At the end of 2020 the lockdown was lifted but since mid-July, 2021, new coronavirus cases were recorded in Uzbekistan – unexpectedly high in recent months, i.e., on July 23, Uzbekistan updated the record for the daily increase in new cases of coronavirus since the beginning of the year – 773.

On October 11, 2021, the cases of the confirmed coronavirus cases demonstrated an increase and surpassed 174,213 in Uzbekistan with the confirmed death reaching 1,271 (see at <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/uzbekistan/>). Tashkent (capital) still leads in the number of infected people but cases are identified again in all regions in Uzbekistan. The vaccination under the national program has started since April 3 but only 5% (1 007 993) of the total of over 20 mln of population to be vaccinated per the national programme as of July 17 2021. In Uzbekistan, citizens are obliged to wear medical masks and take other precautions (social distance, disinfection). Starting March 25, 2021 foreigners entering the republic should present a PCR test certificate issued exclusively by laboratories recognized by the Sanitary and Epidemiological Service of Uzbekistan.

III. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

Purpose

This project evaluation presents an opportunity to assess the achievements of UN Joint Programme “Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley” in an inclusive way and to determine its overall added value to peacebuilding in Uzbekistan, in the areas of youth policy, gender equality, women empowerment, youth employment and participation in political and social life. In assessing the degree to which the project met its intended peacebuilding objective(s) and results, the evaluation will provide key lessons about successful peacebuilding approaches and operational practices, as well as highlight areas where the project performed less effectively than anticipated. In that sense, this project evaluation is equally about accountability as well as learning.

Objectives of the evaluation:

- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project in terms of: 1) addressing key drivers of conflict and the most relevant peacebuilding issues; 2) whether the project responded efficiently to the needs of the actual stakeholders and beneficiaries, the youth or the affected communities in the Fergana Valley; 3) whether the project capitalized on the UN's added value in Uzbekistan; and 4) the degree to which the project addressed cross-cutting issues such as conflict and gender-sensitivity in Uzbekistan; 5) the extend of the project financial and/or programmatic catalytic effects;

- Assess to what extent the PBF project has made a concrete contribution to reducing a conflict factor in Uzbekistan. With respect to PBF's contribution, the evaluation may evaluate whether the project helped advance achievement of the SDGs, and in particular SDG 16;
- Evaluate the project's efficiency, including its implementation strategy, institutional arrangements as well as its management and operational systems and value for money;
- Assess whether the support provided by the PBF has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women's participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality;
- Assess whether the project has been implemented through a conflict-sensitive approach;
- Document good practices, innovations and lessons emerging from the project;
- Provide actionable recommendations for future programming.

IV. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation will be summative and will employ a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide/ verify the substance of the findings. Proposals submitted by prospective consultants should outline a strong mixed method approach to data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate gathered information.

Proposals should be clear on the specific role each of the various methodological approaches plays in helping to address each of the evaluation questions.

The methodologies for data collection may include but not necessarily be limited to:

- Desk review of key documents;
- Key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with major stakeholders including country PBF team, officials from key ministries and the government, representatives of civil society organizations; community and religious leaders. Evaluators should be aware not to deploy KIs with officials, professionals and other higher-status stakeholders while relegating grassroots stakeholders to Focus Group Discussions. ToRs should make clear that the different approaches should meaningfully relate to the different kinds of data yielded by each and their connection to the evaluation questions. ToR should be clear that evaluators must ensure participation among men and women and across age groups;
- Systematic review of monitoring data and internal assessments and evaluations;
- Systematic review of existing, relevant data at the outcome or country context level;
- Systematic review of PBF Eligibility Requests and Annual Reports;
- On-site field visits;
- Surveys.

The evaluation is to be carried out on-site and interviews with stakeholders will be held face-to-face. It is expected that international consultant and national consultants will visit, work at the project implementation regions and carry out on-site data collection. In-country travels will be organized to collect the evidence and feedback from the project beneficiaries as long as it is safe to do. This approach will provide the reliability of the data analysis during the evaluation process. In case the situation with COVID-19 worsens, the evaluation team should take safety measures and be ready to work and conduct interviews and data collection in online mode. Considering the overall epidemiologic situation, the inception report should account for both contingencies. It is expected from the evaluation team to develop a methodology that takes into account the conduct of the evaluation on-site and remotely as well, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the evaluation Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

The final methodological approach including the interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the evaluation Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed among UNDP, PBF, stakeholders and the evaluation team. The evaluation team will consist of an International Evaluator (Team Leader), 2 local National Consultants - Evaluator and Evaluation Team Assistant, who will determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysing data, e.g., questionnaires. However, the evaluation team will be able to revise the approach in consultation with

the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected in the evaluation Inception Report.

The final report must describe the full evaluation approach used and the rationale for the approach, making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

V. Detailed Scope of the evaluation

This evaluation will examine the project's implementation process and peacebuilding results, drawing upon the project's results framework as well as other monitoring data collected on the project outputs and outcomes as well as context. Evaluation questions are based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria as well as PBF specific evaluation criteria, which have been adapted to the context (See Section VI).

Evaluators should take care to ensure that evaluation of the peacebuilding result is the main line of inquiry. Peacebuilding projects frequently employ approaches that work through thematic areas that overlap with development or humanitarian goals. An evaluation of peacebuilding projects, however, must include not only reflection on progress within the thematic area but the degree to which such progress may or may not have contributed to addressing a relevant conflict factor.

The evaluation will assess the theory of change and, if required, offer a reconstructed theory of change that addresses the underlying assumptions about how the anticipated changes are meant to positively affect a conflict factor. The evaluation should then be weighing what was accomplished against these assumptions and aims. A part of that process will involve evaluating project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The evaluation will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the UNDP Evaluation guidelines (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf).

The evaluation should go beyond this if the Logical Framework was inadequate for capturing the higher level changes the project should have been seeking.

A full outline of the evaluation report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed based, as shown below:

ToR Table: Evaluation Ratings Table for the UN Joint Programme titled "Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley"

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Evaluation, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Institutional framework and governance	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	
VI. Evaluation Questions	
<p>The evaluation will take into account criteria such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and ownership, coherence, conflict-sensitivity, catalytic, gender-responsive/gender-sensitive, risk-tolerance and innovation to review the final results and progress of the project. Below are the guiding evaluation questions. The questions will be further agreed with the evaluation team through the inception report. Priorities</p> <p>Relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the project relevant in addressing issues of unemployment among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? Were there any substantial background changes that impacted relevance of project goals and approach? • Did the project meet the needs of the stakeholders and beneficiaries and was it relevant to national priorities set in the sphere of youth policy? • Was the project appropriate and strategic to assist the government in mitigating the socio-economic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? Did relevance continue throughout implementation? • How were stakeholders involved in the project's design and implementation? • Was the project relevant to the UN's peacebuilding mandate and the SDGs, in particular to which the project was expected to contribute: SDGs 5, 8, 10, 16?? • Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the young women and men, girls and boys residing in the Fergana Valley? Were they consulted during design and implementation of the project? • Was the project well-timed to address a conflict factor or capitalize on a specific window of opportunity? • Did the project's theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence? • Did the pandemic create new tensions or exacerbate existing drivers of conflict and if so, how well did the project adapt? <p>Efficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the project (including among RUNOs, implementing agencies and with stakeholders)? Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? • How efficient and successful was the project's implementation approach, including procurement, number of implementing partners and other activities? • How efficiently did the project use the project board? • Were there any significant factors that led to delays in project implementation? • How well did the project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders and project beneficiaries on its progress? • Overall, did the PBF project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently? • To what extent did the PBF project ensure synergies within different programs of UN agencies and other implementing organizations and donor with the same portfolio? <p>Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the PBF project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities? • To what extent did the PBF project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? • How appropriate and clear was the PBF project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? • To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights? <p>Sustainability and Ownership:</p>	

- Did the PBF project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas and policies?
- Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of national capacity etc.) to support positive changes in peacebuilding after the end of the project?
- How strong is the commitment of the government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision making processes, supported under PBF Project?
- How has the project enhanced and contributed to the development of national capacity in order to ensure suitability of efforts and benefits?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?

Coherence:

- To what extent did the PBF project complement work among different entities, especially with government and national partners?

Conflict-sensitivity:

- Did the PBF project have an explicit approach to conflict-sensitivity?
- Were RUNOs and NUNOs' internal capacities adequate for ensuring an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach?
- Was the project responsible for any unintended negative impacts?
- Was an ongoing process of context monitoring and a monitoring system that allows for monitoring of unintended impacts established?

Important Note to evaluation managers: within the structure of the report, the below criteria may either be reflected separately or integrated into the above evaluation criteria. Regardless, the evaluation must identify specific evaluation questions on the below criteria.

Catalytic:

- Was the project financially and/or programmatically catalytic?
- Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding?

Gender-responsive/Gender-sensitive:

- Did the project consider the different challenges, opportunities, constraints and capacities of women, men, girls and boys in project design (including within the conflict analysis, outcome statements and results frameworks) and implementation?
- Were the commitments made in the project proposal to gender-responsive peacebuilding, particularly with respect to the budget, realized throughout implementation?

Risk-tolerance and Innovation:

- Were the risks of the PBF project properly estimated at the design stage and were there any changes during implementation?
- Did the project take suitable risks mitigation actions while implementing the interventions?
- How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?

VII. Timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be approximately 59 working days over a time period of 14 weeks starting on November 22, 2021. The tentative evaluation timeframe is as follows:

Deliverable	Anticipated timing	Number of days
Inception Report	November 22 - December 10, 2021	15 w/d
Analysis of collected field data	December 13 - December 31, 2021	15 w/d

Validation exercise (Presentation of key findings)	4 - 7 January, 2022	4 w/d
Draft report	10 - 21 January, 2022	10 w/d
Final Report	1 - 21 February, 2022	15 w/d

Options for stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc. should be provided in the evaluation Inception Report.

VIII. Evaluation Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	The inception report should include the following key elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall approach and methodology; • Key lines of inquiry, linking refined evaluation questions to data collection instruments; • Data collection instruments and mechanisms; • Proposed list of interviewees; • A work plan and timelines to be agreed with relevant PBF focal points. 	Evaluation team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., by December 10, 2021	Evaluation team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
1.1	Develop design with detailed method, tools and techniques that are gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive, generating information from and about men, women and other marginalized groups, as well as key gender and human rights issues	International Consultant will design method of evaluation and share with National Consultants	At the beginning of evaluation National Consultants will provide reports according to the developed matrix by December 10, 2021	
2	Presentation/validation of preliminary findings to relevant in-country stakeholders and PBF	Initial Findings	End of stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., by January 7, 2022	Evaluation team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management

3	Draft evaluation Report	Full draft report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc., by January 21, 2022	Evaluation team submits to Evaluation Reference Group, composed of representatives of all direct fund recipients and the PBF (at a minimum), for their comments
4	Final Evaluation Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and evaluation Audit trail in which the evaluation details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report <i>(See template in ToR Annex G)</i>	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report by February 21, 2022	Evaluation team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final evaluation reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.² The final accepted version of the report will reflect Evaluation Reference Group's comments. The Final Report must be approved by both the evaluation manager and the PBF.

IX. Evaluation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's evaluation is the UNDP Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the evaluation team. The RUNOs, and implementing partners will collaborate on liaising with the evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up online/on-site stakeholder interviews. The PBF HQ retains the authority of providing ultimate quality assurance to the deliverables and endorse as well as approve deliverables.

X. Team composition

A team of 3 independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation – one international consultant as a team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and 2 national consultants. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the evaluation report, while 2 national experts will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in arranging stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., providing translation to local language, collecting stakeholders' feedback, etc.)

UNDP will sign the contract with each Consultant in accordance with the approved UNDP procurement procedures for an individual contract. Payment for services will be made from the Project funds with satisfactory discharge of duties and achievement of results. The results of the work shall be approved by the UNDP DRR through SPIU Associate/CO Evaluation focal point.

- The National Consultant/Evaluator will work under the direct supervision of the International Consultant (Evaluation Team Leader), with support from SPIU Associate/CO Evaluation focal point
- The Evaluator is responsible for the quality and timely submission of data and materials to the Evaluation Team Leader as well as of the deliverables;
- The National Consultant ensures timely and rational planning, implementation of activities and achievement of results in accordance with the Terms of Reference;
- The Evaluator provides the results of work in accordance with Deliverables;

² Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- The Evaluator shall meet with local beneficiaries, partners and local authorities during the site visits, conduct interviews and collect data required for evaluation;
- The National Consultant shall provide reports in electronic form in MS Word format in English.

Prior to approval of the final report, UNDP Project Manager, in close coordination with SPIU Associate/CO Evaluation focal point and UNDP DRR will circulate the draft for comments to government counterparts: Youth Affairs Agency of Uzbekistan and Steering Committee key members. UNDP, UNODC, UNESCO and PBF HQ will provide comments and suggestions within 5 working days after receiving the draft. The finalized Evaluation Report, addressing all comments received shall be submitted by January 28, 2022.

If any discrepancies have emerged between the findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of the National Consultant (national evaluator) will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in sociology, development studies, political science, statistics or a related field. A first level university degree (Bachelor's degree or equivalent) in similar fields in combination with two additional years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree.

Experience

- At least 4 years of demonstrated relevant work experience at the national level in monitoring, evaluation, reporting, or research is required. The candidate should have understanding of peacebuilding concept. Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered as an asset;
- Demonstrated ability to prepare and follow interview/focus groups protocols and other data collection tools is required;
- Experience in using participatory techniques in data collection, including gender-sensitive and youth-friendly approaches, is required;
- Deep knowledge of the peacebuilding and political context in the country is required;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Knowledge of and experience with youth policy, social cohesion, human rights, youth empowerment, gender equality, women empowerment, etc. is required;
- Demonstrated experience with report writing is required;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Familiarity with the country/region and previous work experience in/with similar geopolitical settings is an asset;
- Experience in conducting remote evaluations is an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Strong analytical skills;
- Familiarity with the UN system is a strong asset;

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English, Russian and Uzbek is required.

XI. Evaluator Ethics

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also

be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

XII. Payment Schedule

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final evaluation Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft evaluation report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final evaluation report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and delivery of completed evaluation Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final evaluation report includes all requirements outlined in the evaluation TOR and is in accordance with the evaluation guidance.
- The final evaluation report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e., text has not been cut & pasted from other evaluation reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

XIII. Application Process³

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template⁴](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form⁵)**;
- c) Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Applicants are requested to apply online through the UNDP website at <http://www.undp.uz>. Application shall be submitted by indicated deadline. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration. Application should contain a current and complete C.V. or PH form 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). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

XIV. TOR Annexes

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by evaluation team

³ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁴ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmati on%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁵ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- ToR Annex C: Content of the evaluation report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: Evaluation Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: Evaluation Audit Trail

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified female candidates, people with disabilities, and minorities are highly encouraged to apply. UNDP Gender Balance in Management Policy promotes achievement of gender balance among its staff at all levels.

XV. Signatures - Post Description Certification

Incumbent *(if applicable)*

Name	Signature
Date	

Officer of Commissioning Unit

Name / Title

Ms. Doina Munteanu	Signature
--------------------	-----------

Date

Deputy Resident Representative

UNDP Uzbekistan

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

ADJUSTED TARGETS BASED ON PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK AT THE INCEPTION PHASE

Outcomes and Outputs	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	Targets and Milestones (initial as per Project Document)	Targets and Milestones (adjusted based on decision of Inception Workshop)	Justification for adjusted indicators and targets
Outcome 1: Young people can act as actors of positive change and have the mechanisms to ensure inclusive service delivery to build community resilience in a period of political and economic transformation	Indicator 1.1: Rate of young people expressing confidence in their self-efficacy, agency, community participation, socio-economic inclusion and sense of belonging. Share of youth (women and men) considering themselves as citizens who are capable to positively influence the policy of local administrations and responsible for community resilience;	N/A	At least 25% of project beneficiaries display improvements in attitudes and perceptions 65%.		
	Indicator 1.2: Number of official decisions, resolutions of the Fergana region administrations adopted based on proposals of Fergana youth initiatives.	N/A	At least 2 decisions/resolutions of one of the khokimiyats from Fergana region, including 1 based on young women initiative.		
	Indicator 1.3: Number of youth initiatives focusing on civic engagement and community development initiated through the project and sustained beyond the project lifecycle. The proportion of citizens satisfied by the work, attitude	N/A	15 initiatives, at least 5 that are led by young women, are sustained 6 months after the project termination through local state budgets or other sources of funding. Increment of satisfaction rate increased by 25 percentage points during the project implementation period.		

	and ethics of public servants of knokimiyats and social protection divisions of three districts of Fergana valley.				
	Indicator 1.4: Number of meetings/community dialogues/town hall discussions/consultations held between youth and duty bearers without the direct intervention of the project	N/A	The project has created the demand within the community and duty bearers to sustain and utilize dialogue platforms created by the project without the direct involvement of RUNO engagement.		
Output 1.1: Young people are equipped with capacities and knowledge that foster their civic participation and socio-economic inclusion	Indicator 1.1: Number of public initiatives and projects regarding most urgent needs of regional development at local level, proposed and promoted by youth for public discussions in mass media.	N/A	20 initiatives announced or exposed for public discussion.		
	Indicator 1.1.1 Number of young women and men who have successfully completed the trainings. Number of young women and men who have participated in summer camps.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35 young women and 65 young men have successfully completed the trainings. - Quarterly reports. - Participant's registry records. - Photo and video footage of completion event. 		
	Indicator 1.1.2: Number of youth union representatives who have successfully completed the trainings.	N/A	45 women and 75 men from youth unions have successfully completed the trainings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarterly reports. - Participants register records. - Photo and video footage of the completion event. 		
	Indicator 1.1.3: Number of youth union representatives who have successfully completed the trainings.	N/A	50 young women and 50 young men have successfully completed the trainings.		

	Indicator 1.1.4: Number of small grant projects received the funding.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 SM projects received the funding, including 3 proposed by women. • 20 SM projects successfully are accomplished, or launched / provided outputs, including 8 proposed by women. 		
	Indicator 1.1.6: Endorsed and reproduced Guide for the School leavers “Getting a Job in Uzbekistan and Globally” [GUIDE] (title is subject to change)	N/A	1. Developed and endorsed GUIDE in Uzbek and Russian languages; 2. Online version of the Guide in Uzbek and Russian languages is functional and hosted by the MoPE; Print versions in Uzbek-5,000 (1 copy per school); and in Russian-1,000		
	Indicator 1.1.7: Number of assessments conducted in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan regions	0	1. Assessment with 2100 conducted in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan regions. 1. 5 Capacity Building workshops on MIL in Fergana Valley		
Output 1.2: Young people are provided with opportunities to constructively participate in decision making, socio-political life and act as key agents of change	Indicator 1.2: Number of initiatives discussed with local administrations and officials on the round tables organized by local youth activists. Number of initiatives, discussed via tv or on-line broadcasted round tables.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 initiatives are discussed on round tables. 5 initiatives are discussed via on-line or tv broadcasted round tables. 		
	Indicator 1.2.1: Number of hubs established and operational. Average monthly number of visitors	N/A	3 hubs are established and operational till July 1, 2021. 150 monthly visitors, on average for each hub.		
	Indicator 1.2.2: Number of public awareness raising campaigns held on the occasion of UN days	N/A	At least 6 campaigns held by July 1, 2021		
	Indicator 1.2.3: Number of small grant infrastructural projects initiated by youth.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60 SMG youth infrastructural projects received the funding, including 20 proposed by women. • 60 SMG youth infrastructural projects successfully are accomplished, or launched / provided outputs, including 		

			20 proposed by women.		
	Indicator 1.2.4: Number of civic engagement initiatives initiated by youth.	N/A	At least 20 initiatives, including 30% proposed by women.		
	Indicator 1.2.5: Volunteerism is provided with a legal base. Number of television and on-line broadcasted round tables and open discussions conducted. Number of regional volunteer organizations established.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legal acts enabling formal launch of volunteers' organizations are prepared and submitted for the attention of national partners. • Mass-media promotion strategy on volunteerism is developed and adopted by national partners. • At least 4 television and on-line broadcasted round tables and open discussions conducted. • At least 4 promo-video footage is prepared. • At least 1 regional volunteer organization established. 		
Output 1.3: The capacity of local administrators and educators to implement government policies and ensure inclusive public service delivery is improved	Indicator 1.3: The rate of successful completion of the trainings delivered to public servants at three districts of Fergana valley	N/A	Above 75% of training participants-public servants from three districts of Fergana region have successfully completed each of the training courses.		
	Indicator 1.3.1: Analytical report elaborated. Number of surveys, consultations and discussions conducted.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict analysis is prepared. • At least 3 rounds of consultations and expert discussions are conducted. • At least 2 surveys are conducted (e.g., victimization survey, corruption risk assessment). 		
	Indicator 1.3.2: Number of schools apply new competency-based school curricula	N/A	18 pilot schools		
	Indicator 1.3.3: Number of guides and course materials developed	N/A	300 set of teacher training consisting of course materials in digital and hard copies.		
	Indicator 1.3.4: Number of policy makers, teachers and educators trained in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan	N/A	Andijan – 100 Namangan – 100 Fergana - 100		

	Indicator 1.3.5: Number of civil servants covered. Number of government agencies delegated servants for trainings. Successful training completion rate	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 300 civil servants are trained. • At least 20 government agencies delegated servants for training. Over 70% of trainees have successfully completed training programs. All training modules are available on-line for registered public servants. 		
	Indicator 1.3.6: Number of young women and men reached by life skills programs	N/A	At least 450, including 50% young women and girls		
	Indicator 1.3.7: Number of policy papers elaborated. Number of consultations and discussions conducted. Whether a draft national plan of action on alignment of public service protocols to human rights standards is developed.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 policy paper elaborated on conflict analysis is prepared. • At least 3 rounds of consultations and expert discussions are conducted. • Draft national plan of action is developed. 		
Output 1.4: Duty bearers have the skills and approaches necessary to address the needs of vulnerable youth on the basis of rule of law and a fair and humane justice system	Indicator 1.4.: Number of participatory and inclusive youth prevention plans developed and implemented	N/A	At least 6 in 6 pilot municipalities in 3 provinces of Fergana Valley		
	Indicator 1.4.1: Number of participatory consultations held	N/A	At least 12 in 6 pilot municipalities		
	Indicator 1.4.2: Number of police officers trained	N/A	Number of police officers trained		
	Indicator 1.4.3: Number of communication and feedback mechanisms targeting youth created	N/A	At least 2		
	Indicator 1.4.4: Number of lawyers trained to provide legal support to young women and men	N/A	At least 60 from 3 provinces of Fergana Valley		
	Indicator 1.4.5: Number of information materials disseminated	N/A	At least 3000 copies of brochures and leaflets disseminated		

	Indicator 1.4.6: Number of prosecutors trained to strengthen their communication skills, effectiveness and transparency in handling complaints and grievances of young women and men in targeted areas.	N/A	At least 60 from 3 provinces of Fergana Valley		
	Indicator 1.4.7 (1): October 1, 2020 Training program developed January 1, 2021 Training conducted	N/A	At least 12 initiatives (2 per plan in 6 municipalities and/or broader policy level initiatives on human rights and anti-corruption in the Fergana Valley)		
	Indicator 1.4.7 (2): Number of practical guides developed on preventing corruption in the education system of Fergana valley (continuum of indicator 1.3.1.2	0	1 guide in Uzbek language		
	Indicator 1.4.7 (3): UNESCO- number of trained key stakeholders on anti-corruption policies and practices in the education system of Fergana valley (continuum of indicator 1.3.1(2))	0	30 persons (key stakeholders)		

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by evaluation team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Final Project Document with all annexes
2	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
3	Inception Workshop Report
4	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
5	All Project Progress Reports (PPRs)
6	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
7	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
8	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
9	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
10	Sample of project communications materials
11	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
12	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
13	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g., number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
14	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
15	Additional documents, as required

ToR Annex C: Content of the Evaluation report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported PBF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and PBF ID
 - Evaluation timeframe and date of final evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - PBF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the evaluation
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with must be given a rating⁶)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - 4.1 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment of evaluation
 - UNDP implementation/oversight and Implementing Partner execution, overall project implementation/execution, coordination, and operational issues
 - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - 4.2 Project Results and Impacts
 - Progress towards objective and expected outcomes
 - Relevance
 - Effectiveness
 - Efficiency

⁶ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Overall Outcome
 - Sustainability: financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance, environmental, and overall likelihood
 - Country ownership
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - PBF Additionality
 - Catalytic/Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - Evaluation Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
 - Evaluation Rating scales
 - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
 - Signed Code of Conduct form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Evaluation Audit Trail

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the PBF Focal area, and to the development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(Include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e., relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e., project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e., document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward the improvement of youth status/policy?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

ToR Annex F: Evaluation Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Evaluation, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

ToR Annex G: Evaluation Audit Trail

The following is a template for the Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final evalaution report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final evaluation report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on January 28, 2022 from the Evaluation of UN Joint Programme “Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley”

The following comments were provided to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

[illegible]