



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

I. Job Information

Office/Unit/Project	Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable, and Transparent governance institutions in Uzbekistan
Title	International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of UNDP project “Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent governance institutions in Uzbekistan”
Duty station (City and Country)	Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Type (Regular or Short term)	Short term
Office- or Home-based	Tashkent city and Ferghana, Sirdarya and Bukhara regions
Expected starting date	February 2023
Expected Duration	30 working days during Jan – Mar, 2023

II. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP policies and procedures, all nationally implemented projects are required to undergo a Final Evaluation (FE) at the end of the project by an independent evaluator selected by the Implementing Entity. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the FE of the project titled “Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent governance institutions in Uzbekistan” implemented through the Government of Uzbekistan, Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan. The project started on the May 1st, 2018. The FE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Evaluation Implementation, June 2021’ (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-4.shtml>).

III. Background and context

Since 2017, Uzbekistan has been implementing several reforms in the area of anti-corruption, which have resulted in significant improvement in the institutional and policy framework of the fight against corruption in the country. Progress has been made since the adoption of the Action Strategy 2017-2021 focusing on an efficient, responsive, transparent, and accountable public administration, and the state anti-corruption programmes for 2019-2020 with a range of corruption prevention measures. An important milestone of this reform was the establishment of the Anticorruption Agency of Uzbekistan in 2020. Due to these continued efforts, in [the 2021 Corruption Perceptions Index \(CPI\) report](#), Transparency International considered Uzbekistan as one of countries that have improved their CPI in the last 5 years. Despite significant achievements, the country has still a long way to go in curbing corruption and restoring citizens’ trust and confidence in government institutions, as there are commitments that are still to be met and challenges to be addressed.

Prevention of Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan (PCEAT) Project was launched by UNDP Country office in Uzbekistan jointly with the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan on March 22, 2018, with policy and advisory support of UNDP’s Global “Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies” (ACPIS) project and UNDP’s Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). The PCEAT project is the largest UNDP initiative on anti-corruption in Europe and CIS region funded by the Government of Uzbekistan with a total budget of \$8mln.

The project aims to provide anti-corruption policy and program support to Uzbekistan to prevent and curb corruption countrywide with a focus on strengthening the national corruption prevention system and monitoring the implementation of the UNCAC and OECD Istanbul Plan of Action in an integrated manner. The key output of the project is “**Anti-corruption solutions, principles and tools are integrated with the public administration systems, public service delivery, civil service performance, the system of law-making and rule-making**”. The implementation of the PCEAT project is supported by UNDP’s global and regional anti-corruption teams, who provide policy and programme support.

In particular, the PCEAT project aims to:

1. Provide legislative and policy support to integrate anti-corruption solutions in the process of law-making, rule-making, and policy advice.
2. Strengthen the capacity, knowledge and skills of civil servants to prevent corruption.
3. Support the digitalization of public service delivery and interaction in government entities to ensure the effective flow of documents and transparency of public services.
4. Promote a culture of intolerance towards corruption in society through knowledge and advocacy, and active cooperation between government, civil society and the private sector.

From October 2020 to January 2021, an independent international consultant carried out a mid-term review of the PCEAT project. Overall, the review concluded that the project implemented anti-corruption interventions and activities in line with Uzbekistan’s Action Strategy for 2017-2021, the State Anti-Corruption Programme of Uzbekistan 2019-2020 (the PCEAT project directly implemented 29 activities out of the program’s total of 35) and Uzbekistan’s commitments under the 2030 Agenda. Moreover, the review found that the ongoing anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan have created momentum for development partners to invest in and the project is stimulating this momentum and sustaining national stakeholders’ interest by introducing best innovative practices and supporting concrete needs.

IV. FE Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

- a) To develop evaluation report (a full outline of the FE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex A) that must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful by assessing project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Results Framework (see ToR Annex B);
- b) To review all relevant sources of information including the Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PPRs, Project Board meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines (SOP), project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for evidence-based evaluation.
- c) To review the baseline, targets and indicators and annual reports submitted to the project’s donors;
- d) To follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, national partner agencies, the UNDP Country Office(s), direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful FE.
- e) To take into account criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, to review the final results and progress of the project (see ToR Annex C: guiding evaluation questions).
- a) To review whether mid-term review recommendations have been addressed and implemented.
- b) To provide forward-looking recommendations on how UNDP Uzbekistan and the Government of Uzbekistan can further enhance corruption prevention mechanisms based on the achievements of the PCEAT project.

c) To deliver results as indicated in the deliverables table.

V. FE Approach & Methodology

Based on UNDP's policies and guidelines on M&E and the standard global practices on reviewing projects/programmes, the independent consultant will propose the methodology to conduct the final evaluation and finalize it with support from the ACPIS team and UNDP Uzbekistan and inputs from UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub.

The review process will entail a combination of desk review of all relevant project related documents, advocacy and training materials, and knowledge products; interviews (Via Zoom, Microsoft Teams or Skype) with the national counterparts, including Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan, General Prosecutor's Office and others, UNDP key staff, senior management, global and regional focal points on anti-corruption, partner organizations, civil society organizations and other beneficiaries of this initiative.

The FE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful and comply with UNDG Evaluations Standards.

The FE consultant/expert will review all relevant sources of information including the Project Document, Project Board meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines (SOP), project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation.

The FE consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Programme Team, government counterparts, national partner agencies, the UNDP Country Office(s), direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful FE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities.

The specific design and methodology for the FE should emerge from online consultations between the FE consultant and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the FE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The FE consultant must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender specific issues are addressed, also, other cross-cutting issues and SDGs should be incorporated into the FE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the FE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the FE consultant. International Consultant will determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysis of data, e.g. questionnaires. However, he/she 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 FE Inception Report.

The final report must describe the full FE 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.

VI. Detailed Scope of the FE

The FE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The FE will assess results according to the

criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP projects ([United Nations Development Programme - Evaluation Guidelines \(undp.org\)](https://undp.org/publications/evaluation-guidelines)).

The Findings section of the FE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the FE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country drivenness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 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
- Management arrangements

ii. 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
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the FE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, etc., as relevant)
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The FE consultant will include a summary of the main findings of the FE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically

connected to the FE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries and UNDP, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The FE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other UNDP interventions. When possible, the FE consultant should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the FE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed based an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for the full-sized project titled “Preventing Corruption through Effective , Accountable and Transparent governance institutions in Uzbekistan”

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	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

VII Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will take into account criteria such as impact, **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability**, to review the final results and progress of the project. Below are the guiding

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, 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)

evaluation questions. The questions will be further agreed with the respective unit through the inception report.

Impact:

- What are the key results and progress achieved against the results and resource framework of the project?
- To what extent were the objectives of the project achieved?
- What indicators demonstrate that?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Is health community volunteerism an effective approach/mechanism to promote healthy livelihood and improved resilience of communities? Why or why not?
- What has happened as a result of the project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- What were the most significant changes that this project has helped to generate?
- Include perception and behavior of communities who generate income from inputs of the project activities
- How many people have been affected? What types/kinds/groups of people have been affected and may be impacted after the project?

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
- To what extent has the project contributed to covid-19 response?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?

- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
- How effective were the organizational structures and operations, as well as policy mandates, among the implementing partners? E.g., support from the UNDP global anti-corruption programme (ACPIS), Istanbul regional hubs and UNDP Uzbekistan?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- 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?
- What are the emerging anti-corruption needs and priorities in Uzbekistan, and what specific areas should any future anti-corruption programme focus on?
- To what extent do project interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

VIII. Timeframe

- a) To review and adhere to the tentative FE timeframe as follows (the total duration of the FE will be approximately 30 working days over a time period of 12 weeks starting):

Timeframe	Activity
20 January, 2023	Application closes
10 February, 2023	Selection of Evaluator
15 February, 2023	Preparation period for Evaluator (handover of documentation)
25 February, 2023	Document review and preparation of FE Inception Report
28 February, 2023	Finalization and Validation of FE Inception Report
28 February -10 March, 2023	Stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc.
13 March, 2023	Presentation of initial findings
17 March, 2023	Preparation of draft FE report
17-20 March, 2023	Circulation of draft FE report for comments
23 March, 2023	Incorporation of comments on draft FE report into Audit Trail & finalization of FE report
24 March, 2023	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
27 March, 2023	Expected date of full FE completion

Options for stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc. should be provided in the FE Inception Report.

IX. FE Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	FE Inception Report	Evaluator clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the FE	No later than 2 weeks before stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc., by 25 February 2023	Evaluator submits Inception Report to project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc., by 13 March, 2023	Evaluator presents to project management
3	Draft FE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex A, C</i>) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc., by 17 March, 2023	Evaluator submits to project management; reviewed by leading Cluster, National Project Coordinator
5	Final FE Report	Revised final report in which the FE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final FE report (<i>See</i>	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report by 27 March, 2023	Evaluator submits both documents to the project management

		<i>template in ToR Annex D)</i>		
--	--	---------------------------------	--	--

*All final FE 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

X. FE Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the FE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's FE 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 FE consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the FE consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up online stakeholder interviews.

XI. Evaluator

An International Consultant will conduct the evaluation and will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the FE report, etc. The expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in arranging stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc., collecting stakeholders' feedback, etc.)

UNDP will sign the contract with the International Consultant in accordance with the approved UNDP procurement procedures for an individual contract with possible mission to Tashkent, Uzbekistan. 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 M&E focal point.

- The Consultant will work under the direct supervision of the UNDP DRR, with support from SPIU Associate/CO M&E focal point
- The Consultant is responsible for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables;
- The Consultant ensures timely and rational planning, implementation of activities and achievement of results in accordance with the Terms of Reference;
- The Consultant provides the results of work in accordance with Deliverables;
- The Consultant shall provide reports in electronic form in MS Word format in English.

Prior to approval of the final report, UNDP Programme Manager, in close coordination with SPIU Associate/CO M&E focal point and UNDP DRR will circulate the draft for comments to government counterparts. UNDP ACPIS programme advisor and manager and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within 10 working days after receiving the draft. The finalized Final Evaluation Report, addressing all comments received shall be submitted by 28 February, 2023

If any discrepancies have emerged between the findings of the evaluator 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.

Required Skills and Experience:

Education:

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

- Master's degree in public administration, law, political science, finance, economics, international relations, development studies, or related field.

Experience:

- At least 10 years of working experience in monitoring and evaluation and (in addition) policy support, programme management or design of governance and anti-corruption programmes/projects;
- A prior record of producing research studies (preferably in governance and anti-corruption),
- A prior record of conducting mid-term or final evaluations related to governance and preferably anti-corruption.

Language Requirements:

- Strong writing skills in English. Knowledge of Russian is an advantage.

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates commitment to UNDP's mission, vision and values;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Demonstrating/safeguarding ethics and integrity;
- Demonstrate corporate knowledge and sound judgment, self-development, initiative-taking;
- Acting as a team player and facilitating teamwork;
- Managing conflict and facilitating and encouraging open communication, communicating effectively;
- Creating synergies through self-control;
- Learning and sharing knowledge and encourage the learning of others;
- Promoting learning and knowledge management/sharing is the responsibility of each staff member;
- Informed and transparent decision-making.

II. Functional Competencies:

1. Communications and Networking

- Has excellent oral communication skills and conflict resolution competency;
- Has excellent written communication skills, with analytic capacity and ability to assess project outputs and relevant findings for the preparation of quality project evaluation reports;
- Demonstrates maturity and confidence in dealing with senior and high ranking members of national and international institutions, government and non-government.

2. Knowledge management and Learning

- Leadership and Self-management;
- Focus on result for the client and responds positively to feedback;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Remains calm, in control and good humored even under pressure;
- Competent in leading team, if any, and creating team spirit, stimulating team members to produce quality outputs in a timely and transparent fashion.

3. Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Ability to organize and complete multiple tasks by establishing priorities;
- Ability to handle a large volume of work under time constraints.

4. Job Knowledge/Technical Expertise

- Understands the main processes and methods of work regarding to the position;
- Strives to keep job knowledge up-to-date through self-directed study and other means of learning;

5. Leadership and Self-Management

- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Demonstrates good oral and written communication skills.

Desired additional skills and competences:

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to labor/employment change adaptation;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Central Asian countries;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and employment change adaptation; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English. Knowledge of Russian will be considered an asset

XII. Evaluator Ethics

The FE consultant 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.

XIII. Payment Schedule

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final FE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit.
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft FE report to the Commissioning Unit.
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final FE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and DRR (via signatures on the FE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed FE Audit Trail.

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

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

XIV. Application Process³

Requested Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁴ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)⁵);
- 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.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:

Only those candidates who meet the minimum level of education and relevant years of experience requirements will be considered for the consultancy. The shortlisted candidates will be scored based on a review of their functional competencies and other criteria as described above. The shortlisted candidates will be invited for interviews.

Combined scoring method: where the qualifications and competencies will be weighted a max of 70% (technical score), and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30% (financial score).

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose cumulative result of technical and financial scores are the highest.

Only those candidates who meet the minimum level of education and relevant years of experience requirements will be considered for the technical evaluation. The technical evaluation will include a desk review of applications/CVs and interviews with shortlisted candidates.

The technical evaluation of shortlisted candidates will be done on the basis of a review of the following:

- Relevant education and degree – (20%)
- At least 10 years of working experience in monitoring and evaluation and (in addition) policy support, programme management or design of governance and anti-corruption programmes/projects – (40%)
- A prior record of producing research studies (preferably in governance and anti-corruption) – (15%)

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

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

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

- A prior record of conducting mid-term or final evaluations related to governance and preferably anti-corruption (15%)
- Knowledge of Russian – (10%)

XV. TOR Annexes

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by FE consultant
- ToR Annex C: Content of the FE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: FE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: FE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: FE 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.

XVI. 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

Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and Resource Framework: UNDAF Outcome 7: By 2020, the quality of public administration is improved for equitable access to quality public services for all.									
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: Indicator: Availability of institutional capacities at central government for policy coherence/planning/resource management/operational coordination (roadmaps) for better public service provision. Baseline: Limited. Target: Yes. Indicator: Improvement of unified national system of civil service (merit based system for appointment/promotion/performance evaluation). Baseline: requires improvement Target: System of professional/ transparent recruitment and promotion of civil servants improved (2020). Indicator: Ranking of Uzbekistan in United Nations e-government development index. Baseline: 100th (2014) Target: 80th (2020) Indicator: Extent to which data accessible, including through open government/open data national mechanism, and used by media/CSOs for public oversight. Baseline: Data scarce; open data mechanism partially reflected in legislation (2014). Target: Data accessible/used to large extent (2020).									
Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021: Strategic Plan Outcome 1. Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions Strategic Plan Outcome 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development; Output 1.2.3 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication Output 2.2.1 Use of digital technologies and big data enabled for improved public services and other government functions									
Project title and Atlas Project Number: "Preventing corruption through effective, accountable and transparent governance institutions in Uzbekistan" Project ID: 00110970 Output ID: 00110170									

EXPECT ED OUTPUT S	OUTPUT INDICATOR S	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)				DATA COLLEC TION METHO DS & RISKS
			Value	Y e a r 2 0 1 8	Ye a r 20 19	Y e a r 2 0 2 0	Y e a r 2 0 2 1	FINA L	
Output 1. Anti-corruption solution s, principle s and tools are	Ranking of country in WB's Control of Corruption index under Worldwide Governance Indicators	WB report	Rankin g	10 ¹ ₂	12	14	16	16	World Bank report

integrated in the public administration systems, public service delivery, civil service performance, system of law-making and rule-making. GEN 1.	Number of laws and by-laws (both drafted and enacted ones) went through anti-corruption screening	Government reports	Number	1534 ¹ ₃	1600	1700	18000	1800	MoJ report
	Number of digital services by government agencies using frameworks that leverage digital technologies and big data for: a) Delivery and monitoring of services b) Public engagement c) Access to and protection of information d) Legal identity and civil registration e) Critical public services (e.g. public procurement)	Government reports, my.gov.uz, data.gov.uz	Number	a) 1 (my.gov.uz) b) 1 (regulation.gov.uz) c) 1 (data.gov.uz) d) 0 e) 1 (www.uzex.uz)	a) 2 b) 2 (e-petitions portal) c) 1 d) 1 e) 2	a) 3 b) 2 c) 2 d) 1 e) 2	a) b) c) d) e)	a) 3 b) 2 c) 2 d) 2 e) 3	Government reports, UNDP reports
	Number of corruption cases reported in the local media	Media reports	Number	1	2	3	4	4	Local mass media reports, press-offices of state authorities
	Number of civil servants and law enforcement officials who advanced their professional skills and knowledge on prevention and countering of corruption in public and private sectors	Government, UNDP reports	Number	0	Men: 40 Women: 10	Men: 70 Women: 20	Men: 100 Women: 40	Men: 100 Women: 40	UNDP reports

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by FE consultant

#	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	All Project Progress Reports (PPRs)
4	Oversight mission reports
5	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
6	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
7	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
8	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
9	Sample of project communications materials
10	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
11	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
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	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
14	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
15	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
16	List/map of project sites
17	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
18	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
19	Additional documents, as required

ToR Annex C: Content of the FE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP
 - UNDP PIMS ID
 - FE timeframe and date of final FE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - FE consultant, and team members, if any
- 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 FE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the FE 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

⁶ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- 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 (*)
- 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
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes

- FE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- FE 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)
- FE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed FE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file: FE Audit Trail*

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the environment and 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 FE 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 reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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).

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: _____

ToR Annex F: FE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, 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: FE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for (*Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (UNDP DRR)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: FE Audit Trail

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

To the comments received on 30 June 2022 from the Final Evaluation of “Promoting Youth Employment in Uzbekistan”

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

[illegible]