



## UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

### I. Job Information

Job title:	International Consultant/Evaluator for Final Evaluation of the Project
Type:	Individual Contract
Project Title/Department:	UNDP-UNFPA Joint Programme "Building the Resilience of Local Communities Against Health, Environmental and Economic Insecurities in the Aral Sea Region" /Environment and Climate Action Cluster
Duration of the service:	15 working/days during March-June 2022
Work status (full time /part time):	Part time
Duty station:	Desk-based work in home country
Expected travel site:	N/A
Reports To:	Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP in Uzbekistan

### II. Introduction

This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the Final Evaluation of the full-sized Joint Programme titled "Building the Resilience of Local Communities Against Health, Environmental and Economic Insecurities in the Aral Sea Region" implemented through the UNDP Uzbekistan as the Implementing Partner in partnership with the Ministry of Economic Development and Poverty Reduction of the Republic of Uzbekistan (MEDPR), Ministry of Health, Council of Ministers of the Republic of Karakalpakstan. The Programme started in January 2020 and as per decision of the Board Meeting is extended for 6 months until June 2022. The FE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'UNDP Evaluation Guidelines' ([United Nations Development Programme - Evaluation Guidelines \(undp.org\)](https://www.undp.org/evaluation-guidelines)).

### III. Background and context

Central Asia, and in particular Uzbekistan, is recognized as one of the world's most vulnerable regions to the impacts of long-term climate change. There is a growing evidence that more frequent extreme weather conditions such as droughts, heat waves, out of season frosts and storms are occurring and to large extent affecting the agriculture and thus vulnerable populations in rural areas.

In the context of UN's support to the Government of Uzbekistan's on efforts to tackle the negative consequences of the Aral Sea crisis, with the financial support of the Government of Japan, UNDP and UNFPA Joint Programme "Building the Resilience of Local Communities Against Health, Environmental and Economic Insecurities in the Aral Sea region" is launched, which is being implemented in Karakalpakstan throughout 2020-2022. The Joint Programme aims to address the most urgent and immediate health and economic insecurities in the most vulnerable areas of the Aral Sea region through bringing innovative solutions to healthcare and poverty reduction initiatives.

The Joint Programme has two major objectives as follows:

- Improving the quality of healthcare services, particularly in remote rural areas through strengthening the technical and institutional capacity of local healthcare system for maternal, child and reproductive health service provision with the focus on prevention of ill health (breast and cervical cancer, sexually transmitted infections, malnutrition, etc.) and promotion of healthy lifestyle and positive health seeking behaviour involving also the Community Health Volunteers.
- Enhancing income generation opportunities of the affected population through inclusive business initiatives, promotion of investment for job creation, as well as through improving access to basic services. The programme will select most vulnerable rural communities and help them with participatory decentralized planning and rehabilitation of essential public services such as water supply. It will support the start-up of agricultural cooperatives and small businesses through trainings, funding innovative schemes, establishing pilot “farm field schools”. These will help people, especially women led households to use available resources, mainly land and water in the most efficient way and generate incomes to sustain their livelihoods.

The programme overall goal is to address the most urgent and immediate health and economic insecurities in the most vulnerable areas of the Aral Sea region through bringing innovative solutions to healthcare and poverty reduction.

Programme combines the mixture of approaches including but not limited to (i) enhancing knowledge, information, innovation and technological exchange; (ii) building people-to-people bonds; (iii) building broad based bottom-up partnerships for impactful implementation of the initiatives of the project; and (iv) enhancing capacity building of local partners to materialize the development dividends.

Programme office is located in Nukus and implements its activities in 10 districts of Karakalpakstan such as Chimbay, Karauzyak, Bozatau, Kegeyli, Hodjeli, Shumanay, Kanlikul, Kungrad, Muynak and Nukus districts

The Programme initial duration was 2 years (January 2020 – December 2021) and as per decision of the Programme Board Meeting it was extended for the period of 6 months until June 2022. Total budget of the Programme is USD 3,211,618 (funded by the Government of Japan).

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 impact of the COVID-19 crisis.

The project beneficiaries are rural communities living in ten regions of Karakalpakstan. COVID-19 lockdown impacted all aspects of lives as health, income generation opportunities (agricultural, livestock, SME and other activities), worsened access to basic social services and etc, due to the strict requirements at the beginning aimed to mitigation of the pandemic impacts. As it is already recognized by the Government, COVID19 impacts result in increased unemployment and poverty, decrease of economy development paces and increased demand for access to basic services, social protection needs as well as health protection and urgent pandemic response measures. In this regard, Programme allocated special budget for COVID-19 response measures in the region and it is obvious that proposed solutions become even much relevant and important to mitigate the COVID19 adverse impacts through reducing/avoiding climate change related losses/damages and

improving quality of health care services, income generation capabilities of rural population and access to the basic services which will contribute to the post-COVID19 recovery in Karakalpakstan.

COVID-19 outbreak and subsequent quarantine measures imposed by the Government of Uzbekistan in March 2020 have had negative impact on implementation of a number of the project outputs as per approved workplan, particularly on those activities that involve:

- travel, both international and local (study tours, local trainings for target audience, etc.);
- meetings and consultations with local authorities and government organizations;
- practical workshops in the fields planned for early summer and the fall;
- field work on identification and implementation of pilot business projects.

Although, these limitations delayed implementation or completion of some activities, they did not significantly affect the overall results of the project. The project continued implementation of its activities remotely, where and when it was possible.

Starting from March 2021 increasing number of new coronavirus cases were recorded in Uzbekistan, with unexpectedly high rate of growth in the last two months. On 30 June 2021, 476 new cases of the confirmed coronavirus were recorded surpassing 11,153 cases in Uzbekistan with the confirmed death reached 740 (see at <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/uzbekistan/>). The Government re-introduced a color-zone approach to track and mitigate the spread of the virus. Based on this approach, Tashkent city (capital) was marked as red, while Tashkent and Samarkand regions are yellow and the remaining part of Uzbekistan is green, although a number of cases are being registered there as well. The vaccination under the national program has started since 3 April and 9.66% of the total of over 20 mln of population to be vaccinated per the national programme have been vaccinated as of 27 June 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.

#### **IV. FE Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives**

The FE report will assess the achievement of Joint Programme results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and help in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The FE report will promote accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The FE will assess the Programme performance (in terms of impact, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The FE will have two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNDP, the donor and their national partners such as the Ministry of Economic Development and Poverty Reduction, Ministry of Health, Council of Ministers in Karakalpakstan, the State Plants Quarantine Inspection of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Inspection) and their regional office in Karakalpakstan, as well as district administrations and farmers, subsistent small farmers (dekhans) and rural communities of pilot districts of Karakalpakstan (Chimbay, Karauzyak, Bozatau and etc).

The Programme is on its last year of the implementation cycle and the FE is included into the Commissioning Unit's. i.e. UNDP Country Office, Evaluation Plan for 2022 as FE's outcomes and recommendations will be instrumental for development of new climate change and adaptation project proposals for various donors through establishing a sound and well-informed ground for establishment of baselines and conducting an evidence-based situation analysis.

During the COVID pandemic lockdown in 2020, UNDP developed a proposal for the Country Allocation of UNDP COVID-19 Rapid Response Facility Resources for COVID-19 Crisis, which was endorsed, and funding was provided. The Programme contributed to this initiative through supporting the community-based initiatives aimed at improving the socio-economic early recovery and supporting livelihoods, improving access to the clean drinking water and sanitary. Over 500 gynecologists, midwives, oncologists, general practitioners, & patronage nurses were trained on early screening of cervical cancer by using HPV testing & visual diagnostic, counselling & treatment. 8 labs for HPV testing with 50,000 HPV test kits & reagents were installed, staff trained on its use. Over 30 business initiative projects were selected in transparent and open selection process for provision of technical assistance and creation of employment opportunities for rural population, especially women and youth, in three regions of Karakalpakstan. The Programme procured and provided the requested equipment to those business projects to start and/or expand their businesses to overcome negative impacts of pandemic. Access to basic services improved through 14 rural infrastructure (water, electricity etc) projects in three districts.

## **V. FE Approach & Methodology**

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

The FE team 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 team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation.

The FE team 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 online interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Ministry of Economic Development and Poverty Reduction, Ministry of Health, Council of Ministers of Karakalpakstan, administrations (khokimiyats) of target districts, regional departments of agriculture, economic development and poverty reduction, Council of farmers, dehkans, and owners of household plots; senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, programme beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

Since 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 has been restricted since 25 March 2020 and travel within the country was also restricted. Subsequently the lockdown was lifted, but since beginning of 2022, a new wave of coronavirus (Omicron) cases was recorded in Uzbekistan – unexpectedly becoming high in recent months. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the FE mission, then the FE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the FE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the FE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the FE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as some government and national counterparts may not possess required skills and facilities. These limitations must be reflected in the final FE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultant can work remotely with national evaluator's support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. The safety of stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff is the key priority. FE team is expected to conduct online interviews with the project stakeholders and beneficiaries at the programme pilot districts (in 3-10 pilot districts of Karakalpakstan). The field mission to Uzbekistan and visits to the programme pilot districts in Karakalpakstan are not envisaged, due to COVID19 pandemic and corresponding restrictions for international and in-country travels and physical meetings. If the pandemic restrictions will not be further applied to in-country travels to the project pilot regions, a mission to the project pilot communities and sites will be envisaged for implementation by a qualified and independent National Evaluator (will be hired) to collect the evidence and feedback from the project beneficiaries as long as it is safe to do so.

The specific design and methodology for the FE should emerge from online consultations between the FE team 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 team 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 online 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 team. The evaluation team will consist of the International Evaluator (Team Leader) and National Evaluator, who will determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysis of 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 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://www.undp.org/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 team 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 team 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 “Building the Resilience of Local Communities Against Health, Environmental and Economic Insecurities in the Aral Sea Region”**

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>1</sup>
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 evaluation questions. The questions will be further agreed with the evaluation team through the inception report.

Impact:

- 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?

<sup>1</sup> 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)

- 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 inouts 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?

#### **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?
- 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**

The total duration of the FE will be approximately 15 working days over a time period of 12 weeks starting in March 2022. The tentative FE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
10 March 2022	Selection of FE team
17 March 2022	Preparation period for FE team (handover of documentation)
25 March 2022	Document review and preparation of FE Inception Report
31 March 2022	Finalization and Validation of FE Inception Report based on the feedback received from UNDP
1 April 2022	Stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc.
25 April 2022	Presentation of initial findings
10 May 2022	Preparation of draft FE report
17 May 2022	Circulation of draft FE report for comments

27 May 2022	Incorporation of comments on draft FE report into Audit Trail & finalization of FE report
30 May 2022	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
2 June 2022	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	FE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the FE	No later than 1 week before stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc., by 25 March 2022	FE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc., by 25 April 2022	FE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft FE Report	Full draft report ( <i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i> ) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of end of stakeholder online meetings, interviews, etc., by 10 May 2022	FE team submits to Commissioning Unit; Project Coordinating Unit
5	Final FE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and FE Audit trail in which the FE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final FE report ( <i>See template in ToR Annex H</i> )	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report by 27 May 2022	FE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

\*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.<sup>2</sup>

## 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 team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the FE team to provide all relevant documents, set up online stakeholder interviews.

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

## **XI. FE Team Composition**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the FE – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team national expert. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the FE report, etc. The national 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., providing translation to local language, 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. 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: the Ministry of Economic Development and Poverty Reduction of Uzbekistan, Project Board key members and UNDP RTA. UNDP 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 27 May 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 international evaluator will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

### Education

- Master's degree in environment, climate science, agriculture, economics, natural resources management or other closely related field;

### Experience

- 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 climate change adaptation;
- Experience in evaluating projects, including remote evaluations;
- Experience working in Central Asian countries;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate 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;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely 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 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.

**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.

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 FE, 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.

## XIV. Application Process<sup>3</sup>

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

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

## XV. EVALUATION

### Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (70%) and financial criteria (30%) specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; [70 points]

\* \* Financial Criteria weight; [30 points]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of technical score) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Max. Point</b>
<u>Technical</u>		

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

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

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

<p><i>At least ten years of experience in management or review of public finance, conservation finance or environmental finance.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Less than 10 years in not accepted</i></li> <li>▪ <i>10-13 years – 15</i></li> <li>▪ <i>more than 14 years - 20</i></li> </ul>	20%	20
<p><i>At least three years in the field of working with international and national experts and institutions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Less than 3 year in not accepted</i></li> <li>▪ <i>3-5 years – 5</i></li> <li>▪ <i>6 and more – 10</i></li> </ul>	10%	10
<p><i>Experience of work in previous Environment, Climate Change, Adaptation, Livelihoods/Community Development projects and activities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>1 project – 5</i></li> <li>▪ <i>2 projects – 10</i></li> <li>▪ <i>3 and more – 15</i></li> </ul>	15%	15
<p><i>Consultant experience in Central Asia region (projects, research, publications etc.).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>1 project (publication, policy review) – 5</i></li> <li>▪ <i>2 and more – 10</i></li> </ul>	10%	10
<p><i>Fluency in written and spoken English. Knowledge of Russian would be an advantage.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>English - 10</i></li> <li>▪ <i>English and Russian – 15</i></li> </ul>	15%	15
<u>Financial offer</u>	30%	30

#### **XVI. TOR Annexes**

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

#### **XVII. Signatures - Post Description Certification**

Incumbent (*if applicable*)

Name

Signature

Date

Officer of Commissioning Unit

Name / Title

Ms. Doina Munteanu

Signature

Deputy Resident Representative

UNDP Uzbekistan

Date

## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

### Results Framework

Title of the programme: "Building the Resilience of Local Communities Against Health, Environmental and Economic Insecurities in the Aral Sea Region"									
JP Outputs  (Give corresponding indicators and baselines)	Participating UN organization-specific Outputs	Participating UN organization	Participating UN organization corporate priority	Implementing Partner	Indicative activities for each Output	Resource allocation and indicative time frame*			Total
						Y1 2020	Y2 2021	Y3 (June) (continuation of 2021)	
Output 1.1. Primary Health Care Service providers improved their capacities to deliver quality services to local population;  Indicators: 1.1.1. Availability of data on systemic issues in the healthcare service provision on programme interventions 1.1.2. Number of primary health care providers trained on cervical and breast cancer prevention and control; 1.1.3. Number of laboratory service providers trained on performance of new HPV testing;	UNDAF Outcome 4: By 2022, all people benefit from quality, equitable and accessible health services throughout their life course (Indicators: 4.6 and 4.7);	UNFPA	UNFPA focuses on the three directions: (a) an end to preventable maternal deaths; (b) an end to the unmet need for family planning; and (c) an end to gender-based violence and all harmful practices.	Ministry of Health of Uzbekistan,  Ministry of Health of Karakalpakstan	1.1.1. Needs assessment conducted to identify systemic issues in the healthcare service provision to better inform programme response interventions	11 000,00	-		11 000,00
1.1.4. a) Availability of fully functioning real-time PCR HPV testing laboratory; b) Number of women between the age of 30-49 undergone cervical cancer screening program with proper follow-up; 1.1.5. Number of newly-married and pregnant women					1.1.2. Ten trainings to be organized for primary health care providers of the selected districts (5 days each) on cervical and breast cancer prevention	93 600,00	23 400,00		117 000,00



received anti-anemic supplements									
<p>Baselines:</p> <p>1.1.1. Lack of available data</p> <p>1.1.2. No primary health care providers trained on cervical and breast cancer prevention and control;</p> <p>1.1.3. No laboratory service providers are trained on performance of new HPV testing;</p> <p>1.1.4. a) Absence of fully functioning real-time PCR HPV testing laboratory b) No data about women between the age of 30-49 undergone cervical cancer screening program with proper follow-up;</p> <p>1.1.5. No data about newly married and pregnant women supplied with anti-anemic supplements</p>					1.1.3. Training of newly established staff of PCR laboratory	20 000,00	-		20 000,00
<p>Targets:</p> <p>1.1.1. Need Assessment findings available for interventions planning.</p> <p>1.1.2. 250 primary health care providers trained on cervical and breast cancer prevention and control;</p> <p>1.1.3. 12 laboratory service providers trained on performance of new HPV testing</p>					1.1.4. Provision of newly established PCR Lab with HPV testing equipment and consumables	680 000,00	-		680 000,00
<p>1.1.4. a) 1 fully functioning real-time PCR HPV testing laboratory is established; b) 50,000 women between the age of 30-49 undergone cervical cancer screening</p>					1.1.5. Provision with anti-anemic supplements for women of reproductive age in the	50 000,00	50 000,00		100 000,00

program with proper follow-up; 1.1.5. 40,000 newly-married and pregnant women receive anti-anemic supplements;					affected territories				
	1.1.6. Subtotal 1.1.:					854 600,00	73 400,00		928 000,00
Output 1.2. Population is better informed about health issues to lead healthy lifestyle by using preventive health care services and compliance to treatment regimen and local women empowered to enhance their enjoyment of sexual and reproductive health rights;	UNDAF Outcome 4: By 2022, all people benefit from quality, equitable and accessible health services throughout their life course (Indicators: 4.6 and 4.7);	UNFPA	UNFPA focuses on the three directions: (a) an end to preventable maternal deaths; (b) an end to the unmet need for family planning; and (c) an end to gender-based violence and all harmful practices.	Ministry of Health of Uzbekistan,  Ministry of Health of Karakalpakstan	1.1.7. Awareness raised on cervical and breast cancer prevention among the general public on a community level in order to empower women to enhance their sexual and reproductive health rights	80 000,00	-		80 000,00
Indicators: 1.2.1. Number of women benefited from gained knowledge on cervical and breast cancer control and prevention; 1.2.2. Number of people gained evidence-based knowledge on STI/HIV prevention 1.2.3. Number of teacher's manuals on healthy lifestyles published; 1.2.4. Number of teachers trained on healthy lifestyles; 1.2.5. Number of rural people with better knowledge on healthy lifestyle;					1.1.8. Communication strategy, using innovative tools, was developed for raising awareness on STI/HIV prevention	75 000,00	-		75 000,00
Baselines:					1.1.9. Preparing teacher's manual on	16 000,00	-		16 000,00

1.2.1. Women are not aware of cervical and breast cancer control and prevention; 1.2.2. Lack of evidence-based knowledge on STI/HIV prevention among rural people 1.2.3. No teacher's manuals on healthy lifestyles published in Karakalpak language; 1.2.4. No data about teachers trained on healthy lifestyles; 1.2.5. No data of rural people with better knowledge on healthy lifestyle;					healthy lifestyle in Karakalpak language and publishing;				
Targets: 1.2.1. 40,000 newly-married and pregnant women benefited from gained knowledge on cervical and breast cancer control and prevention; 1.2.2. 80,000 people gained evidence-based knowledge on STI/HIV prevention					1.1.10. Organizing training for the teachers on effective use of the manual;	16 000,00	4000,00		20 000,00
1.2.3. 200 teacher's manuals on healthy lifestyles published; 1.2.4. 200 teachers trained on healthy lifestyles; 1.2.5. 15,000 rural people with better knowledge on healthy lifestyle;					1.1.11. Organizing of two rounds of peer educating programme (5 days each) to initiate the youth engagement in the work with communities on raising their awareness of healthy lifestyle;	4 000,00	4 000,00		8 000,00
	1.1.12. Subtotal 1.2.:					191 000,00	8 000,00		199 000,00
Output 1.3 Multi-sectoral response mechanism to domestic violence strengthened in line with			UNFPA focuses on the three		1.1.13. Conducting the analysis on the current	10 000,00	-		10 000,00

international standards for essential service provision and inter-sectoral coordination.	UNDAF Outcome 4: By 2022, all people benefit from quality, equitable and accessible health services throughout their life course (Indicators: 4.6 and 4.7);	UNFPA	directions: (a) an end to preventable maternal deaths; (b) an end to the unmet need for family planning; and (c) an end to gender-based violence and all harmful practices.	Ministry of Health of Uzbekistan,  Ministry of Health of Karakalpakstan	status of inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination in prevention and response to domestic violence;  1.1.14.				
Indicators: 1.3.1. Availability of multi-stakeholder response mechanism; 1.3.2. Availability of SOPs for key stakeholders; 1.3.3. Availability of set of indicators for data collection for WCU and SSC					1.1.15. Tailoring to the local context the globally developed standard operating procedures (SOPs) for key stakeholders (health, law enforcement, psychological welfare, etc.)	17 000,00	-		17 000,00
1.3.4. Number of key stakeholders trained on tailored SOPs of applying multi-sectoral response to domestic violence and data issues; 1.3.5. Number of staff of key service providers trained on introducing multi-sectoral response concept on domestic violence and improving quality of services					1.1.16. Supporting the representative offices of WCU and SSC in the development and integration of a set of indicators for which data needs to be collected routinely by the involved parties;	13 000,00	7 000,00		20 000,00

Baselines: 1.3.1. Multi-stakeholder response mechanism not in place; 1.3.2. Absence of tailored SOPs for key stakeholders; 1.3.3. Absence of indicators for data collection for WCU and SSC 1.3.4. Lack of trained key stakeholders on tailored SOPs; 1.3.5. Lack of knowledge among the staff of key service providers					1.1.17. Organizing a series of specialized and joint trainings for key stakeholders on tailored SOPs of applying multi-sectoral response to domestic violence and data issues	36 000,00	20 000,00		56 000,00
Targets: 1.3.1. Multi-stakeholder response mechanism is in place; 1.3.2. 3 tailored SOPs developed for key stakeholders (health, law enforcement, psychological welfare, etc.); 1.3.3. Set of indicators developed for data collection for WCU and SSC 1.3.4. 60 key stakeholders trained on tailored SOPs of applying multi-sectoral response to domestic violence and data issues; 1.3.5. 300 staff of key service providers on multi-sectoral response concept on domestic violence and improving quality of services.					1.1.18. Organizing of trainings for the staff of the key service providers (health, law enforcement, psychological welfare, etc.) on: 1) introducing the concept of multi-sectoral response to domestic violence; 2) improving the quality of services provided in line with international standards.	30 100,00	12 900,00		43 000,00
	1.1.19. Subtotal 1.3:					106 100,00	39 900,00		146 000,00
Output 2.1 Local entrepreneurship initiatives supported with focus on skills development for rural women in agriculture, manufacturing and service sector with the aim of	UNDAF Outcome 1: By 2022, equitable and sustainable		UNDP's Strategic Plan (2018-2021) focus on the	Ministry of Economy and Industry, Council of	1.1.20. 20 new SMEs created by rural communities applying innovative	96 000,00	266 000,00		362 000,00

<p>enhancing overall economic well-being of vulnerable communities;</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>2.1.1. a) Number of SMEs created by rural communities applying innovative technologies to tackle poverty and benefit the population of 3 target districts;</p> <p>b) Number of people with improved economic and food security from the local products produced</p> <p>c) Number of new job places created;</p> <p>2.1.2. a) Number of rural people trained on innovative methods of managing agriculture;</p> <p>b) Number of local farmers/households enhanced their agricultural capacities based on best practices;</p> <p>Baselines:</p> <p>2.1.1. a) 27 SMEs created by rural communities applying innovative technologies to tackle poverty;</p> <p>b) 30,000 people provided with improved economic and food security from the local products produced;</p> <p>c) 123 new job places created;</p> <p>2.1.2. a) Lack of knowledge on innovative methods of managing agriculture among rural people;</p> <p>b) Low agricultural capacities of local farmers/households;</p>	<p>economic growth is expanded for all through productive employment and improvement of the environment for business, entrepreneurship and innovations for all</p>	<p>UNDP</p>	<p>following three board development contexts:</p> <p>Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions;</p> <p>Accelerate structural transformations</p> <p>Build resilience to shocks and crisis</p>	<p>Ministries of RK, Khokimyats of the target districts, target Communities</p>	<p>technologies to tackle poverty and benefit the population of 3 target districts of Karakalpakstan;</p>				
<p>Targets:</p> <p>2.1.1. a) 20 new SMEs created by rural communities applying innovative technologies to tackle</p>					<p>1.1.21. Strengthening and enhancing the skills of local population</p>	<p>6 000,00</p>	<p>7 000,00</p>		<p>13 000,00</p>

poverty and benefit the population of 3 target districts b) 5,000 people have improved economic and food security from the local products produced; c) 150 new job places created; 2.1.2. a) Over 100 rural people trained on innovative methods of managing agriculture; b) Over 2,500 local farmers/households enhanced their agricultural capacities based on best practices;					through series of trainings				
	1.1.22. Subtotal 2.1					108 500,00	339 277,78		448 277,78
Output 2.2. Communities have increased access to rural infrastructure and business opportunities in selected sectors (agriculture, fishery, food processing, etc.);  Indicators: 2.2.1. Availability of evidence-based data about economic potential of target communities; 2.2.2. Number of local people trained on capacity and skill building trainings; 2.2.3. Level of practical application of Japanese experts' best practices in agribusiness; 2.2.4. Availability of inter-district value chain networks through e-commerce tools;	UNDAF Outcome 1: By 2022, equitable and sustainable economic growth is expanded for all through productive employment and improvement of the environment for business, entrepreneurship and innovations for all	UNDP	UNDP's Strategic Plan (2018-2021) focus on the following three board development contexts: Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions; Accelerate structural transformations Build resilience to shocks and crisis	Ministry of Economy and Industry, Council of Ministries of RK, Khokimiyats of the target districts, target Communities	1.1.23. Situation analysis of economic potential of target communities	8 000,00	4 000,00		12 000,00
Baselines: 2.2.1. Limited evidence-based data about economic potential of target communities;					1.1.24. Tailor-made capacity and skill building trainings for local people with the focus	8 500,00	4 000,00		12 500,00

2.2.2. 829 local people, including women and youth trained on capacity and skill building trainings;					to rural women and girls				
2.2.3. Lack of knowledge and practice about Japan's best practices in agribusiness; 2.2.4. Absence of inter-district value chain networks through e-commerce tools;					1.1.25. Organization of the visit of Japanese experts to bring the best practices in engagement of local communities/ entrepreneurs in agribusiness	13 000,00	10 000,00		23 000,00
Targets: 2.2.1. Situational Analysis about the economic potential of target communities conducted; 2.2.2. 250 girls and youth trained on capacity and skill building trainings; 2.2.3. Visit of Japanese experts organized to share best practices; 2.2.4. E-commerce potential increased to promote trade development among districts and establishing inter-district value chain networks					1.1.26. Unleashing e-commerce potential in rural areas with an aim of connecting local producers with other regional markets in order to promote trade development among districts and establishing inter-district value chain networks	4 000,00	4 500,00		8 500,00
	1.1.27. Subtotal 2.2:					33 500,00	22 500,00		56 000,00
Output 2.3. Local communities in Karakalpakstan have skills in community-based planning and development;	UNDAF Outcome 1: By 2022, equitable and sustainable economic growth is expanded for all	UNDP	UNDP's Strategic Plan (2018-2021) focus on the following three board	Ministry of Economy and Industry, Council of Ministries of RK, Khokimiyats of	1.1.28. Inception workshops in target districts and at regional level on community mobilization for identification of	3 000,00	4 000,00		7 000,00



	through productive employment and improvement of the environment for business, entrepreneurship and innovations for all		development contexts: Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions; Accelerate structural transformations Build resilience to shocks and crisis	the target districts, target Communities	community needs and preparation of Community Development Plans.				
Indicators: 2.3.1. Number of inception workshops conducted; 2.3.2. Number of CDPs developed; 2.3.3. Number of infrastructure projects supported; 2.3.4. Number of project estimation documents prepared; 2.3.5. Number of rural people with (a) improved access to better health infrastructure; (b)connected to sustainable electrification; (c) connected to drinking water pipelines; (d) schoolchildren with improved education facilities have access to better quality education;					1.1.29. Series of workshops on Community Development Planning, SDG localization and Human Security Concept at community levels	5 000,00	5 000,00		10 000,00
Baselines: 2.3.1. 33 inception workshops conducted; 860 community members trained on problem identification/prioritization and WASH 2.3.2. 33 CDPs developed; 2.3.3. 33 infrastructure projects supported; 2.3.4. 33 project estimation documents prepared;					1.1.30. Preparation of social infrastructure projects	3 000,00	5 000,00		8 000,00

2.3.5. 21,191 rural people received access to (a) better health infrastructure; (b) sustainable electrification; (c) drinking water pipelines; (d) schoolchildren with improved education facilities, quality education;										
<p>Targets:</p> <p>2.3.1. 20 inception workshops conducted; 2,500 community members trained on problem identification/prioritization and WASH</p> <p>2.3.2. 20 CDPs developed;</p> <p>2.3.3. 16 infrastructure projects supported;</p> <p>2.3.4. 16 project estimation documents prepared;</p> <p>2.3.5. 15,000 rural people have (a) improved access to better health infrastructure; (b)connected to sustainable electrification; (c) connected to drinking water pipelines; (d) schoolchildren with improved education facilities have access to better quality education;</p>					1.1.31. Development of project estimation documents for social infrastructure projects in the pilot districts	5 000,00	5 000,00		10 000,00	
					1.1.32. Implementation of social infrastructure projects in the pilot districts	159 500,00	449 500,00		609 000,00	
	1.1.33. Subtotal 2.3:						182 920,00	516 080,00		699 000,00
<p>Output 2.4. Document the best-practices and results of the project and galvanize additional donor funds for replication and scale up of results through the Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund for Aral Sea region.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>2.4.1. Availability of functional communication strategy; Number of reports on best practices;</p>	<p>UNDAF Outcome 1: By 2022, equitable and sustainable economic growth is expanded for all through productive employment and improvement of the environment</p>	UNDP	<p>UNDP's Strategic Plan (2018-2021) focus on the following three board development contexts: Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions;</p>	<p>Ministry of Economy and Industry, Council of Ministries of RK, Khokimyats of the target districts, target Communities</p>	1.1.34. Document the results of the project and showcase them to development partners for further upscale and replication through the Multi-partner Human Security Trust Fund	10 000,00	5 000,00		15 000,00	

2.4.2. Number of new project documents formulated and presented to donors;	for business, entrepreneurship and innovations for all		Accelerate structural transformations Build resilience to shocks and crisis						
Baseline: 2.4.1. Outdated communication strategy available; 1 Brochure with best practices developed; 2.4.2. 7 project documents formulated and presented to donors, 5 projects funded; Targets: 2.4.1. New communication strategy developed; at least 2 reports on best practices developed; 2.4.2. At least 1 new project proposal formulated and presented to donors;					1.1.35. Provide advisory support to relevant government institutions and capacity building on early disaster risk reduction based on the human security concept and with the focus to the Aral Sea region.	8 000,00	6 000,00		14 000,00
	Subtotal 2.4:					23 500,00	57 000,00		80 500,00
UN organization 1 (UNDP) 2020-2022	Programme Cost ** (UNDP) 2020-2021)					400 500,00	1 143 300,56		1 543 800,56
	Indirect Support Cost**(GMS UNDP) (8%) 2020-2021					133 836,48	104 061,16		237 897,64
UN organization 2 (UNFPA) 2020-2022	Programme Cost								
	Indirect Support Cost								
Total	Programme Cost (UNFPA + UNDP)					1 806 792,48	1 404 825,72		3 211 618,20
	<b>Indirect Support Cost</b>								

## ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by FE 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	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 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 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 rating<sup>6</sup>)
  - 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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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

<b>Evaluative Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
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 &amp; 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

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

(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: 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

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

**Commissioning Unit (UNDP DRR)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

