



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
TERMS OF REFERENCE/SERVICE CONTRACT

I. Job Information

Job title:	International Consultant for Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the Project
Type:	Individual Contract
Project Title/Department:	Improved Public Service Delivery and Enhanced Governance in Rural Uzbekistan
Duration of the service:	40 working/days during June - August 2022
Work status (full time /part-time):	Part-time
Duty station:	Tashkent
Expected travel site:	Tashkent city and pilot regions
Reports To:	Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP in Uzbekistan

II. Background and context

The project aims to enhance the capacity of government agencies for improved public service delivery by expanding accessibility to public services, integrating service delivery systems and decentralising their access; as well as by enabling the necessary mechanisms to support these changes and ensuring their sustainability. By improving delivery of public services, the project will contribute to improving the quality of life of vulnerable sectors of the population in rural areas - such as women, youth and children, the elderly, and people with disabilities – by enhancing their access to public services and by increasing the quality of service delivery. This project also aims to strengthen citizen participation through a variety of outreach and social accountability mechanisms that enhance people’s voice in decision-making processes and increase their access to information; effectively increasing the transparency of Uzbekistan’s local governance system. The project objectives are congruent with government policy demands in designing and implementing initiatives that would foster institutional effectiveness, transparency and participation and change management. Thus, project objectives are clearly linked with the country’s reform aspirations and strategies.

The project goals are in line with several of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). For example, project activities contribute towards the achievement of SDG 16 calling for the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development and for building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. At the same time the project activities are also promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, technological advancement and innovation for all women and men, including young people and persons with disabilities and equal pay for work of equal value (SDG 8). Furthermore, project activities has advance achievement of gender equality by empowering all women, ensuring women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in the political, economic and public life (SDG 5).

The Project has the following components:

- **Activity 1:** Build an enabling environment for improved public service delivery by streamlining regulatory framework and relevant policies, and encouraging data-driven and evidence-based policy making,
- **Activity 2:** Enhance institutional capacities of the PSA, the MoJ and associated agencies to develop, plan, implement and monitor public service delivery policy implementation via the PSCs,
- **Activity 3:** Build technical capacity of at least 5 PSCs in the pilot regions to showcase an exemplar model of public service delivery aiming to win public trust and overcome concerns with regard to the viability of one-stop shops,
- **Activity 4:** Introduction of pilot participatory planning and governance systems in local Government in the pilot regions to ensure that public service delivery addresses the needs of the people, in particular the vulnerable groups.

The Outcomes of the Project are:

1. Build an enabling environment for improved public service delivery by streamlining regulatory framework and relevant policies and encouraging data-driven and evidence-based policy making.
2. Enhance institutional capacities of the Public Services Agency (PSA), the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and associated agencies to plan, develop, implement and monitor public service delivery policy implementation via the PSCs.
3. Build technical capacity of at least 5 PSCs in the pilot regions to showcase an exemplar model of public service delivery aiming to win public trust and overcome concerns with regard to the viability of the one-stop-shops
4. Introduce and pilot participatory planning and governance systems in local governments in the pilot regions to ensure that public service delivery addresses the needs of people, in particular of vulnerable groups.

The Outputs of the Project are:

Output 1: (1.1) review of regulatory and policy framework pertaining to public service delivery at the central and local government levels; (1.2) standardisation of service management practices and procedures; (1.3) quality assessment of existing service delivery level and development of proposals for streamlining delivery; (1.4) functional review of government organisations engaged in public service delivery; (1.5) development and implementation of an action plan for the rapid digitalisation of government records and archives; (1.6) introduction of data analysis tools across the public service delivery system; and (1.7) implementation of pilot blockchain-based solutions in public service delivery.

Output 2: (2.1) Capacity development and training for PSA and PSC personnel; (2.2) provision of trainings to personnel of government agencies responsible for development and provision of public services; (2.3) improve access to information about public services through various channels; (2.4) enhance the PSA’s integrated information system, call centre and situation centre; and (2.5) introduction of an internship programme at PSA/PSC for university and college students.

Output 3: (3.1) assessment of demand for most popular public services; (3.2) streamline provision of at least 22 public services provided through the PSCs in the 5 pilot regions; (3.3) Support the establishment of regional centres for innovative ideas, digital skills & women empowerment; (3.4) pilot public-private partnerships (PPP) in public service delivery; (3.5) improvement of user experience by upgrading the design, layout, furnishing and equipment of the PSCs; and (3.6) promotion of the PSCs through awareness raising campaigns conducted.

Output 4: (4.1) digital transformation of selected public services, including licensing activities of the khokimiyats and other governmental organizations & integration them with PSCs; (4.2) train public servants on planning, RBM methods and techniques; (4.3) introduction of key performance indicators (KPI) and reporting systems in pilot khokimiyats; (4.4) develop manuals and guidelines for pilot khokimiyats; (4.5) facilitate interaction between public authorities and civil society to strengthen public participation and encourage dialogue; and (4.6) introduction of gender-sensitive approaches to public service delivery.

Partnerships:

The Ministry of Justice is the key national implementing partner for the project. Other project’s national partner institutions are Ministry of Economic Development and Poverty Reduction, Senate of Oliy Majlis, Ministry for Development of Information Technologies and Communications, local khokimiyats of pilot regions and districts.

Target groups and beneficiaries:

In addition to government institutions and civil servants, the beneficiaries of the Project are in both the public and private sectors, including the general public, vulnerable groups and NGOs.

III. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

Purpose

The main purpose of this Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) is to assess progress towards the achievement of the Project’s outputs/outcomes (as per the Project result framework) and identify potential challenges in Project implementation so far. It will assess intermediate signs of Project success or failure with an aim of

recommending eventual course corrections in the second half of the Project lifetime and, if necessary, set the Project on-track in order to increase the probability for achieving its intended results by the end of its duration.

The consultant is expected to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation, and to come up with recommendations regarding the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the remaining period of the Project, after evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of implementation, as well as assessing the achievements the project outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will also assess early signs of project success or failure and prompts adjustments. The results and recommendations of the evaluation would therefore help UNDP Project team to document lessons learnt and best practices for the next project cycle.

The scope of the mid-term evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the indicated duration of the project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives.
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments to document lessons learnt.
- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the programme.

Objectives of the evaluation:

- Assess whether the project design was clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
- An evaluation of the project's delivery of achievement of its overall objectives;
- An evaluation of project's performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the project document;
- Evaluate the project's efficiency, including its implementation strategy, institutional arrangements as well as its management and operational systems and value for money;
- Progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities;
- Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach;
- Document good practices, innovations and lessons emerging from the project;
- Provide actionable recommendations for future programming.

IV. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among programme staff, the evaluators and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluator, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The evaluation should use a combined methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (national and local Government institutions, UNDP COs, development partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and other selected mechanisms (e.g. key informant interviews, focus group discussions and et cetera). Further data on the project indicators will be used by the evaluation to assess the project progress and achievements.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, possible field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

- Desk review of programme document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of the Board meeting, mission reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
- Review of specific products produced so far, including datasets, management and action plans, publications (e.g. blogs, media et cetera) and other material and reports;
- Interviews with the Project Manager, donor, consultants, relevant CO management and staff;

- Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, namely the EBRD, etc.;
- Surveys and questionnaires to target direct beneficiaries including male and female participants in development programmes, and/ or questionnaires to other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels. Digital data collection tools are used in UNDP Uzbekistan, namely KOBO Toolbox. All results from field surveys are captured as part of lessons learned and used in dashboards and to generate baseline data for future projects and interventions.
- Focus group discussions with all stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the project manager, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.

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

V. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the planned Project outcomes and outputs have been achieved since the beginning of the Project in May 2019 and likelihood for their full achievement by the end of the Project in November 2023 (based on the Project Document and its results framework).

The MTE will look into the Project's processes and activities, strategic partnerships and linkages in the specific country's context that proved critical in producing the intended outputs and the factors that facilitated and/or hindered the progress in achieving the outputs, both in terms of the external environment and risks, crisis caused by the pandemic, as well as internal, including weaknesses in programme design, management and implementation, human resource skills, and resources.

The evaluation will also assess the cross-cutting aspects of the Project, such as gender equality and human rights and innovativeness in result areas.

To the extent possible, the MTE will also consider the results of the Project's contribution to address the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

VI. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

The evaluation will take into account criteria such as **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, visibility and gender equity** to review the final results and progress of the project. Below are the guiding evaluation questions. The questions will be further agreed with the evaluation team through the inception report. Priorities

Impact:

- To what extent were the objectives of the project achieved?
- To what extent and degree were the lives of vulnerable, underrepresented, rural women, women/men with disabilities, youth were improved?
- What indicators demonstrate that?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- To what extent were the project's approach and implementation mechanisms to promote sustainable livelihood and improved resilience of communities impactful? What is the evidence?
- What has happened as a result of the project?
- What real difference has the project 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?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men or vulnerable groups?

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the Gender Equality Strategy of UNDP, 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?
- Has the project been screened for gender equality and the gender marker assigned to this project representative of reality?
- 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 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 project's objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- 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, female and male beneficiaries and changing partner priorities?
- How effective was the project's strategy to involve women, marginalized, disadvantaged and poor in the realization of its activities?

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 was the UNDP project implementation structure gender balanced?
- 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 have the M&E systems utilized ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- Are/ have there {been} any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will/ have financial and economic resources be {been} available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are/ have there any {been} social or political risks that may/ could jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?

- Did the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operated pose risks that could jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose a social (including human rights, women’s rights) threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent has the stakeholders’ ownership been sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent have the mechanisms, procedures and policies been in place 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?

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

VII. Timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be approximately 40 working days over a time period of 12 weeks starting on June, 2022. The tentative evaluation timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
June 15, 2022	Application closes
July 1, 2022	Selection of Evaluator
July 15, 2022	Preparation period for Evaluator (handover of documentation)
	Document review and preparation of Inception Report
	Finalization and Validation of Inception Report
July 30, 2022	Stakeholder online/offline meetings, interviews, etc.
August 15, 2022	Presentation of initial findings
August 30, 2022	Preparation of draft evaluation report
September 5, 2022	Circulation of draft evaluation report for comments
	Incorporation of comments on draft report into Audit Trail & finalization of report
TBC	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
September 15, 2022	Expected date of full completion

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

VIII. Evaluation Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	The inception report should include the following key elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall approach and methodology; • Key lines of inquiry, linking refined evaluation questions to data collection instruments; • Data collection instruments and mechanisms; 	International Consultant clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., by July 15, 2022	International Consultant submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed list of interviewees; A work plan and timelines to be agreed. 			
1.1	Develop design with detailed method, tools and techniques that are gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive, generating information from and about men, women and other marginalized groups, as well as key gender and human rights issues	International Consultant will design method of evaluation and share with National Consultants	At the beginning of evaluation International Consultant will provide reports according to the developed matrix by July 30, 2022	
2	Presentation/validation of preliminary findings to relevant in-country stakeholders	Initial Findings	End of stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., by August 15, 2022	Evaluation team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft evaluation Report	Full draft report with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., by August 30, 2022	Evaluation team submits to Evaluation Reference Group, composed of representatives of all direct fund recipients, for their comments
4	Final Mid-term Evaluation Report	Revised final report in which the evaluation details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report by September 15, 2022	Evaluation team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final evaluation reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.¹ The final accepted version of the report will reflect Evaluation Reference Group's comments.

IX. Evaluation Arrangements

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

The Commissioning Unit will contract the Evaluator. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the evaluation team. The UNDP CO and implementing partners will collaborate on liaising with the International Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up online/on-site stakeholder interviews.

X. Team composition

A team of 2 independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation – one international consultant as a team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and 1 national consultant. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the evaluation report, while the national expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building,

¹ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

work with the Project Team in arranging stakeholder online/on-site meetings, interviews, etc., providing translation to local language, collecting stakeholders' feedback, etc.)

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

- The Consultant will work under the direct supervision of the UNDP DRR, with support from SPIU Associate/CO Evaluation 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 Project Manager, in close coordination with SPIU Associate/CO Evaluation focal point and UNDP DRR will circulate the draft for comments to government counterpart – Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan. UNDP will provide comments and suggestions within 5 working days after receiving the draft. The finalized Evaluation Report, addressing all comments received shall be submitted by August 15, 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 Team Leader (international evaluator) will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in sociology, development studies, political science, statistics or a related field;

Experience

- At least 7 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with designing and conducting evaluations of development, peacebuilding experience is preferred or peacebuilding interventions is required. Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered as an asset;
- Extensive experience in mixed methods research and participatory gender-sensitive approaches is required;
- Knowledge of and experience with youth policy, social cohesion, human rights, youth empowerment, gender equality, women empowerment is required;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Demonstrated experience with report writing is required;
- Familiarity with the country/region and previous work experience in/with similar geopolitical settings is an asset;
- Experience in conducting remote evaluations is an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Strong analytical skills;
- Familiarity with the UN system is a strong asset;

Language

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

XI. Evaluator Ethics

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and

other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

XII. Payment Schedule

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

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

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

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

XIII. Application Process²

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)³ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form)**⁴;
- 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.uz.undp.org>. 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.

² Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

³ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

XIV. TOR Annexes

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by evaluation team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the evaluation report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: Evaluation Rating Scales

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

XV. Signatures - Post Description Certification

Incumbent (*if applicable*)

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

Officer of Commissioning Unit Name / Title		
---	--	--

Ms. Doina Munteanu Deputy Resident Representative	Signature	Date
--	-----------	------

UNDP Uzbekistan

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

ADJUSTED TARGETS BASED ON PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK AT THE INCEPTION PHASE

	Project Results Chain	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Overall Project Outcome	1. Improve the well-being of vulnerable population groups in rural areas through better access to streamlined public services	1. Average number of people in five pilot rural areas receiving public services through the PSCs per month (disaggregated by sex and age)	1. Around 20 000 people in the five pilot areas receive public services through PSCs per month, due to scarcity of such centres in their locality (2018)	1. Around 40 000 people in rural areas will be receiving public services through the PSCs per month by the end of the project cycle	Data collected by project and PSCs over time	<p>Assumption: Drive for modernisation and implementation of reform-oriented initiatives will not lose momentum in the years ahead.</p> <p>Risk: Medium (not likely to lose reform momentum).</p>
Specific outcome	1.1 Improved public service delivery across the country, especially in rural areas	1.1 Number of modernized PSCs opened and delivering integrated public services in rural areas;	1.1 No modernized PSCs delivering public services in rural areas;	1.1 At least 5 PSCs modernized by the end of the project cycle	Data collected by project over time; Annual reports of Ministry of Justice and the Government of Uzbekistan	<p>Assumptions: Establishment and operation of the pilot PSCs be fully supported by relevant government agencies in offering quality public services; BPR and other measures implemented will raise quality of services offered.</p> <p>Risks: Targets may not be achieved due to slow and inefficient response from relevant government agencies or if resistance for change is not sufficiently overcome;</p>
		1.2 Number of quality public services offered to rural populations through the PSCs in the five pilot regions.	1.2 No quality public services offered to rural populations through the PSCs in the five pilot regions.	1.2 At least 22 quality public services offered by the end of the project cycle		
Output 1	1. Build an enabling environment for	1.1.1 Number of regulations amended	1.1.1 No regulations amended through the	1.1.1 At least 5 regulations pertaining	National legislation and regulatory	Assumptions:

	Project Results Chain	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
	improved public service delivery (streamline regulatory framework, relevant policies, and introduce data-driven evidence-based policy-making)	with the support of the project to better suit the PSC public service delivery modality	support of the project (2018)	to corresponding public services amended by the end of the project cycle	documents approved by the Ministry of Justice	Relevant government agencies, including the MoJ and the PSA, and other key decision-makers are receptive to the proposed recommendations and changes through amendments, service standards and functional reviews; PSA and PSC personnel are receptive to trainings and thus improve their attitudes and enhance their knowledge and skills; distributed ledger technologies are considered a valuable tool in public service delivery. Risks: Regulation amendments and/or service standards and functional reviews results submitted are not adopted by the Government; Public servants approach trainings offered as formality rather as opportunity to learn new ways of providing public services; Distributed ledger technologies' benefits are not comprehended or considered useful under prevalent circumstances.
		1.1.2 Status of Public Service Standards	1.1.2 No Public Service Standards exists (2018)	1.1.2 At least 2 Public Service Standards developed and submitted to the Government	Policy briefs and proposed standards documents shared with the Government	
		1.1.3 Number of proposals for improving the quality of public services delivery based on analytical tools developed to assess quality levels of service delivery	1.1.3 No proposals on improving the quality of public services delivery based on analytical tools developed to assess quality levels of service delivery (2018)	1.1.3 At least 5 proposals developed and submitted to the Government on improving the quality of public service delivery	Analytical reports with proposals for improving quality of public services	
Output 2	Enhance professional capacity of the PSA, the MoJ and other associated government agencies	2.1.1 Number of PSA, MoJ and other associated government agencies personnel trained	2.1.1 No personnel trained on user-centric service design and delivery (2018)	2.1.1 At least 1000 personnel (with at least 350 of women)	Training reports and assessments of training and other capacity development activities; number of	Assumptions: MoJ, PSA and other associated government agencies are receptive to trainings and improve

	Project Results Chain	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
	to develop, plan, implement and monitor public service delivery	through developed modules (disaggregated by gender);		trained throughout project cycle;	international experts involved in these trainings	their attitudes and enhance their knowledge and skills to develop and provide improved public services;
		2.1.2 Number of roadmap documents developed on transfer of front-office operations from relevant government agencies to PSCs;	2.1.2 No comprehensive road map on transferring front office operations exists (2018)	2.1.2 At least one comprehensive Strategy and road map developed and submitted to the Government	Road map accepted and approved by the Government of Uzbekistan	government agencies are willing and able to transfer their front-office operations to PSCs; universities interested to participate in internship programmes. Risks: Public servants approach trainings as formality and not as opportunity to acquire skills and knowledge to develop innovative way in public service delivery; Corporate web portal not maintained appropriately leading to loss of appeal by citizens; insufficient incentives prevent university students from taking part in internship programmes at PSCs
Output 3	Build technical capacity of at least 5 PSCs in the pilot regions to showcase an exemplar model of public service delivery aiming to win public trust and overcome concerns with regard	3.1.1 Number of PSCs established using ergonomic principles equipped with relevant IT hardware and software	3.1.1 No PSCs exist established using ergonomic principles equipped with relevant IT hardware and software (2018)	3.1.1 At least 5 PSCs established using ergonomic principles in their design and layout and equipped with relevant IT hardware and software	Project and PSA annual reports;	Assumptions: PSCs will prove attractive and convenient modality to deliver public services to the population; local population will be sufficiently interested to provide innovative ideas for public service delivery; Private sector is willing to participate in the set-up and
		3.1.2 Number of awareness raising	3.1.2 No such items developed (2018)	3.1.2 At least one 2 TV/radio awareness		

	Project Results Chain	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
	to the viability of one-stop shops	items, i.e. TV/radio advertisements, printed material, infographics, videos, etc (act. 3.9)		raising item; at least 2 video showcasing the PSCs; sufficient printed information material distributed in the regions; at least 1 per quarter newsletter on PSC development progress; sufficient number of press releases to coincide with the opinion of PSCs in the pilot regions	transcripts; printed matter prepared for the purpose; video, press releases, etc	<p>operation of PSCs through the PPP modality;</p> <p>There is sufficient demand by local population to enhance their digital skills;</p> <p>Communication campaign will be effective in raising awareness of PSCs and new public service delivery modalities among the population.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Lack of proper communication strategy may not help showcase the benefits of receiving public services through PSCs;</p> <p>Local residents may not have sufficient incentives to provide innovative ideas;</p> <p>Lack of incentives prevents the private sector entering into PPP with the PSA;</p> <p>Local residents may not be interested in enhancing their digital skills due to life's or other circumstances;</p>
Output 4	Participatory planning governance systems introduced and piloted at the local government level to	4.1.1 Dashboard for monitoring activities of PSCs in real time at the MoJ and PSA level developed;	4.1.1 No existence of online information tools for monitoring activities of PSCs (2018)	4.1.1 An on-line tool developed for monitoring PSC activities by the end of the project cycle	Ministry of Justice or Government annual reports.	<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Relevant government agencies, including MoJ and PSA, as well as key decision-makers are receptive</p>

	Project Results Chain	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
	ensure public service delivery modalities and local budget priorities address needs of people, especially of vulnerable groups of the population	4.1.2 Number of institutional arrangements established to engage citizens, especially women, in planning local budgets and monitoring their execution in regions;	4.1.2 There is no practice of engaging citizens, especially women, in planning local budgets and monitoring their execution in regions (2018)	4.1.2 One Public Council established and in being operational in each pilot region by the end of the project cycle	Data collected by the project about the existence of institutional arrangements	<p>to proposed recommendations and changes;</p> <p>Local governments possess the necessary capacity and resources to introduce participatory planning and public service delivery monitoring systems;</p> <p>Local population actively involved in public sector reform with respect to citizen participation in decision-making.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Local government unable or unwilling to introduce participatory mechanisms in local governance;</p> <p>Local population disinterested in pursuing active role in decision-making processes at the local level due to lack of sufficient incentives.</p>

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

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

ToR Annex C: Content of the Evaluation report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported EU-funded project
 - Project ID
 - Evaluation timeframe and date of evaluation report
 - Region/ countries included in the project
 - Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations' summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the evaluation
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with must be given a rating⁵)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - 4.1 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment of evaluation
 - UNDP implementation/oversight and Implementing Partner execution, overall project implementation/execution, coordination, and operational issues
 - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - 4.2 Project Results and Impacts
 - Progress towards objective and expected outcomes
 - Relevance
 - Effectiveness

⁵ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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
 - Catalytic/Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - Evaluation Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
 - Evaluation Rating scales
 - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives 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 evaluation mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e., document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward the improvement of youth status/policy?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

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

ToR Annex F: Evaluation Rating Scales

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