## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

## Terms of Reference

**International Consultant to conduct Mid-Term Evaluation of the GEF Chu-Talas IWRM Project**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** Kyrgyzstan

**Application Deadline:** April 27, 2017

**Category:** Energy and Environment

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Assignment Type:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** approx. May 3, 2017

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 25 effective person-days

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** Estimated 25 effective person-days during May-June 2017 (17 effective person-days home based and 8 effective person-days on field mission to Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), Astana and Taraz (Kazakhstan)

**BACKGROUND**

**A. Project Title**

UNDP-GEF “Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in Chu-and Talas River Basins” Project

##### **B. Project Description**

The GEF Medium Size Project (MSP) “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins” enables integrated water resources management in the transboundary Chu-Talas basins, including support to the Transboundary Water Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. It is under implementation of UNDP Kyrgyzstan in a partnership with UNDP Kazakhstan, UNDP IRH and UNECE.

The project responds to the threats posed by increasing water consumption to meet growing social, industrial and agricultural needs, compounded by climatic variability and change. Pressure on scarce water resources and aquatic ecosystems has been growing in recent years across the basins generating risks of conflicts between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan over water allocation.

The project strengthens coordination and expand the role of transboundary institutions in balancing water uses and improving water quality and conservation of aquatic ecosystems, and strengthen monitoring capacity and technologies. It contributes towards the joint management of the water resources of the Chu and Talas river basins. The project builds on the on-going cooperation of the Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan under the Agreement on Use of Interstate Water Management Facilities signed in 2000.

The project includes the following components:

* **Component 1:** Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) including climate scenario analyses to inform adaptive management of the Chu-Talas shared water resources;
* **Component 2:** Building the foundation for broadened and improved bilateral water cooperation and development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) ;
* **Component 3:** Strengthening capacity of water resources monitoring in the Chu and Talas River Basins.

The GEF Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme Manual[[1]](#footnote-1) guides development of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and the Strategic Action Programme (TDA&SAP), those are foreseen to be developed within the project (**Components 1 and 2**).

Employed International TDA Consultant, first, held training on TDA/SAP methodology for the group of nominated officers from the leading Governmental Institutions in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and then led the work on the review of available data and information, then in cooperation with employed national experts from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and under the supervision of the Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) have developed the preliminary draft TDA.

The preliminary draft TDA had been considered at the Extended Meeting of the Secretariat of Chu-Talas Water Commission (CTWC) on July 14-15 2016. The draft TDA was recommended for presenting to the next 22nd Session of CTWC in November 2016 and the Commission at said meeting accepted it.

Decision to develop the SAP was also adopted by CTWC at its 22nd Session on November 30, 2017. For this purpose, CTWC has authorized its Secretariat to form the special Working Group from representatives of respective Ministries and Agencies of two countries.

Within **Components 1 and 2** the project supports holding of meetings of CTWC, its Secretariat and Working Groups related to SAP development as well as ensures completion of the development of CTWC web-site in accordance with GEF IW: LEARN Guidelines.

The **Component 3** of the project is targeted on capacity building on water quality and quantity monitoring and programming of water quality improvement in two basins. Within this component one direct contract with Kazhydromet and one Letter of Agreement with Kyrgyzhydromet were agreed and implemented for assessment of water quality in Chu and talas River Basins.

##### **Project Summary Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins |
| **Executing Agency:** | UNDP |
| **Business Unit:** | KGZ10 |
| **PAC Meeting Date:** | 10 Nov 2014 |
| **Award ID:** | 00081980 |
| **Atlas Project ID:** | 00091092 |
| **PIMS number:** | 5167 |
| **Start Date:** | September 2014 |
| **End Date:** | September 2017 |
| **Management Arrangement:** | DIM[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| **Total allocated resources (US$):** | **$7,239,397.04** |
| **GEF** | **$1,000,000** |
| **Co-financing:**  Shared Waters Partnership (cash) | $65,427.04 |
| Government of Kazakhstan | $750,000 |
| Government of Kyrgyzstan | $1,170,000 |
| Swiss Development Cooperation (cash in-parallel) | $2,200,000 |
| Government of Finland (in-kind) | $1,313,970 |
| UNECE (cash and in-kind) | $440,000 |
| UNDP (in-kind) | $300,000 |

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks**

The MTR team will consist of an independent consultant that will conduct the MTR - 1 international evaluator and supported with an Interpreter (Russian-English-Russian). The consultant shall have a prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Consultant will bear responsibility over submission of a final report. The selected evaluator should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The MTR consultant will first conduct a desk review of the project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, AWPs, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Board meetings’ minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference. Then they will participate in an MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to following:

* UNDP Senior Management;
* The Chu-Talas Water Commission (CTWC) Co-Chairs from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and the Secretariat
* The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic – GEF Operational Focal Point;
* Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan - GEF Operational Focal Point
* Kazhydromet
* Kyrgyzhydromet
* Chu-Talas Basin Authorities in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan
* UNDP “Sustainable Development” Dimension and its projects;
* UNDP Kazakhstan project coordinator;
* NGOs;
* UNECE Regional Adviser on Environment
* GEF RC in UNDP IRH

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the [*Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf) for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

1. **Project Strategy**

*Project Design:*

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities
* Review decision-making processes

*Results Framework/Logframe:*

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

1. **Progress Towards Results**

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

1. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Using the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; assess the following categories of project progress:

* Management Arrangements
* Work Planning
* Finance and co-finance
* Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
* Stakeholder Engagement
* Reporting
* Communications

1. **Sustainability**

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:

* Financial risks to sustainability
* Socio-economic risks to sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
* Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR consultant will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

##### **D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit:

* MTR Inception Report: MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 1 week before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: (May 10, 2017)
* Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR field mission. Approximate due date: (May 20, 2017)
* Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 2 weeks of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (June 5, 2017)
* Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: (June 25, 2017)

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

**E. Institutional Arrangement**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant, and ensure the timely provision of due payments and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The Certifying Officer of this assignment is Sustainable Development Dimension Chief.

**F. Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *25* effective person-days over a period of 10 *weeks* starting *March 20, 2017*. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

* *3 days:* Desk review and preparing MTR Inception Report;
* *2 days:* Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission;
* *8 days:* MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (including Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission);
* *7 days:* Preparing draft report;
* *2 days:* Incorporating audit trail on draft report;
* *3 days:* Finalization of MTR report/Expected full MTR completion.

The start date of the contract is planned for May 3, 2017.

**G. Duty Station**

**Travel:**

* One international travel for 8 effective person-days of field mission to Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, Astana and Taraz, Kazakhstan will be required during the MTR mission;
* The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Statement of Medical Fitness for Work:

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 62 years of age are required, at their own cost, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from an UN - approved doctor prior to taking up their assignment.

Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

* Inoculations/Vaccinations

Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP;

* Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>.
* The Individual Consultant must obtain security clearance before travelling to the duty station;
* All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to duty station. UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket and daily allowance exceeding UNDP rates. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

|  |
| --- |
| **Qualifications** |
| Master degree in the field of natural sciences or environmental or water resources management |
| Minimum 5 years of professional experience in the fields of environmental or water resources management |
| Proven track record of evaluation of projects focusing on international waters confirmed with at least two project evaluations |
| At least one project evaluation with GEF M&E policies and procedures |
| Knowledge of priorities and principles of international waters, confirmed with at least two projects |
| Excellent English communication skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset |

***Consultant Independence:***

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

***Financial Proposal:***

* Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
* Individual on this contract is not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.
* The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

***Schedule of Payments:***

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 2 installments, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final MTR Report.

**June 5, 2017 -** 40% upon submission of the draft MTR Report;

**June 25, 2017 -** 60% upon finalization of the MTR Report.

**J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

1. Completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;
2. **Personal CV or a** [**P11 Personal History form**](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc), indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate;
3. Copy of **ID card**;
4. Copy of **diploma**;
5. **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)
6. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. 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. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Documents with a subject “International Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation” should be submitted no later than 15:00 (Bishkek time, GMT+6), 27 April 2017 to email: procurement@undp.kg or by post to the address below: United Nations Development Programme,160, Chuy Avenue, Bishkek, 720040, Kyrgyz Republic

Receipt of bids will be made only during working hours from 09.00 – 17.00PM

**K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

Lowest price among technically compliant candidates.

**Annex A: List of documents for review by the International Consultant**

1. PIF

2. UNDP Project Document

4. Project Inception Report

6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)

7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams

8. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area)

9. Oversight mission reports

10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

**The following documents will also be available:**

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems

14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)

15. Minutes of the (Project Title) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

16. Project site location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of MTR report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * 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 * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTR mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report * *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)* | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

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

**ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

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

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

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

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

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

**ToR ANNEX G: Project Results Framework**

# Project Results Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  Kyrgyzstan: By the end of 2016 sustainable management of energy, environment and natural resources practices are operationalized.  Kazakhstan: By the end of 2015, communities, national and local authorities use more effective mechanism and partnership that promote environmental sustainability and enable them to prepare, respond and recover from natural and man-made disasters. |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  Kyrgyzstan:  % of people who have equitable access to climate resilient eco systems services;  % of water use efficiency for agricultural and energy production;  % of population benefiting from non-carbon energy sources.  Kazakhstan:  1. Number of national legislative frameworks that introduced policy reforms to better address water-related challenges;  2. Number of transboundary coordination or cooperation mechanisms;  3. Extent of national buy-in to transboundary coordination or cooperation mechanisms. |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area**  Outcome #2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance   * Output 2.5 - Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled  to ensure the  conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation   [Indicator 2.5.2.](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/office/exo/IRRF/SitePages/Indicator%202.5.2.aspx) Number of countries implementing national and local plans for Integrated Water Resources Management |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** International Water - 3 |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Transboundary institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management demonstrate sustainability |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Cooperation frameworks agreed with sustainable financing identified |

| Project strategy | Verifiable indicators | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Targets | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| **Objective:** Strengthening transboundary cooperation and promoting integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basins, and empowering the Water Commission of Republic of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic | Science based consensus on major transboundary environmental concerns and possible solutions (TDA), leading to agreement between the two countries on a joint program of corrective actions (SAP) and on harmonized monitoring and data exchange protocols.  The Water Commission strengthened through improved water monitoring ability, and its mandate expanded to include environmental aspects. | Currently, transboundary cooperation in the Chu-Talas basins is mainly limited to the implementation of the existing water sharing agreement and does not include consideration of ecosystem integrity and environmental sustainability in view of climatic variability and change.  Deteriorated moniroting networks hinder ability of the Commission to implement the water sharing agreement. | At the end of project:  SAP endorsed by countries at Ministerial level.  Governments approve expandaded mandate of the Water Commission and establish Environmental Expert Group.  Water quantity and quality monitoring procedures harmonized. | Governments of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan adopt appropriate changes in the Statutes of the Commission/Secretariat which envisages expansion of areas of bilateral water cooperation, and will formally endorse the SAP, and new monitoring protocols. | Governments and national executive agencies and local governance structures, water users and communities in two basins support interstate water cooperation. |
| **Component 1**  *Outcome 1:* Science based consensus among the countries on major transboundary problems of the basin.  *Outcome 2*: Improved understanding of the transboundary implications of the shared nature of the Basins’ water resources.  *Outcome 3*: Improved knowledge of the consequences of extreme weather situations.  *Outcome 4*: Capacitated local stakeholders ready to minimize negative consequences for economic sectors as well as the environment in the basin. | The TDA of the Chu and Talas Basins prepared jointly by the two countries, identifying issues of transbundary concern. | At the moment there is not common understanding over transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins among the stakeholders in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan | TDA completed and approved by first semester of Year 2 | Transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) of Chu-Talas river basins approved by the Water Commission. | Timely and adequate support in TDA development by all stakeholders. |
| Considerations based on Water Scenarios, on climate variability and change and surface-groundwater interactions included into the TDA. | Currently there is no common understanding of possible future water resources scenarios in the basin.This hinders the decision making process on adaptation measures. | TDA document including consideratiopn of future water scenarios and surface-groundwater interactions. | The TDA and the Report on Future Water Scenarios approved by the Chu-Talas Commission and by key government agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. | Timely and adequate support by stakeholders in scenarios development. |
| Program for seminars on climate change adaptation and integrated water resources management approved by the Commission and implemented. | Currently, local governments and others stakeholders in both basins are not prepared to adequately respond to the possible social, economic and environmental implications and risks associated with the transboundary nature of the water resources of the bains and with increased climate variability and change. | Seminars developed and held within first semester of Year 2 of the project implementatioin. | Seminar reports showing adherence with initialprogram; number of trainees. | Stakeholders actively participate in seminars. |
| **Component 2**  *Outcome 5*: Visioning process and agreement on priorities for action opens the way for systematic cooperation in the integrated management of the transboundary Chu Talas River Basins.  *Outcome 6:* Strengthened collaborative mechanism for bilateral cooperation framework or the further improvement of joint management of the Chu and Talas basins.  *Outcome 7:* Steps taken for the involvement of stakeholders in the decision making proces.  *Outcome 8*: Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally | The Strategic Action Program (SAP), with a 5 years horizon and reflecting inter-sectoral dialogue and stakeholder involvement and addressing the major issues of transboundary concern agreed upon by the two countries. | There is currently no detailed joint integrated program to address major transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins, and stakeholders have little participation in discussions and decision-making. | SAP endorsed at Ministerial level by the end of project | SAP document formally adopted for implementation by the competent authorities of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. | Political will to implement the SAP in the countries.  Water users, NGOs and local communities will actively participate in the process of discussion and decision-making in water management and conservation in Chu-Talas river basins. |
| Amendment to the Commission regulations establishing a clear environmental mandate, and a joint Environmental Expert Group. | Currently, the functions and competencies of the Chu-Talas Commission are limited to joint water management (quantity) coordination in the two basins. | Amendment to the Statutes of the Commission/Secretariat adopted by governments by end of Year 1. | Joint decision on the changed statutes by the competent organs in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan | Political will to improve regulatory framework and participation for bilateral water cooperation |
| Twinnings and experience exchanges with other transboundary basins, dissemination of project results and participation to IW LEARN activities | No ongoing or previous outreach, dissemination and awareness raising activities related to the two basins management. | Twinning with at least another river basin showing similar characteristics and problems, and communication platform (website) established during the early project phases | Published project materials. Website performance. | Active participation of project staff and stakeholders in the dissemination of information on lessons learned and project experience. |
| **Component 3**  *Outcome 9:* Improved basis for the dialogue on transboundary water management on the basis of a better understanding of the quantity and quality of water resources, and their variability in the two basins.  *Outcome 10*: Countries capacity built for improved coordinated monitoring.  *Outcome 11*: Consensus on joint monitoring activities between the two countries. | Report containing the assessment of present situation of surface and groundwater quantity and quality monitoring including redommendations for an harmonized system completed. | Currently latent conflict situations between Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan exist in regulation of water resources distribution and allocation, and pollution in both basins due to differences in technologies and procedures for monitoring the quantity and quality of water resources. | Assessment Report completed and approved by the Commission and by national agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, by the end of Year 2. | Assessment Report and proof of approval by the Commission and governmental agencies. | Political will and support from national executive agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan to strengthen collaboration between stakeholders over water resources monitoring. |
| Reports containing (i) the assessment of capacity building needs in water resources monitoring; (ii) a program for ad hoc training of staff of the two countries; (iii) the results of the capacity building activities and events, including number of participants and results assessment | Currently, water monitoring is poor and sporadic based on limited number of observations and indicators. Staff has no capacity to use new monitoring technologies. | Reports on needs assessment and on implementation and results of training program prepared by the end of the project. | Reports approved by the Commission and by national agencies of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. | Active participation of project staff and stakeholders in the dissemination of information on lessons learned and project experience. |
| Formal agreement on harmonized monitoring and data exchange protocols in the two basins. | No approved rules for transboundary water quality monitoring and information exchange exist | Agreement between the two countries formalized by project completion. | Text of Agreement and proof of approval by the two countries at governmental level. | Sustained political support from Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan for joint harmonized monitoring of shared water resources. |
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