Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project Title:	"Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in Chu and Talas River Basins"
Functional Title:	International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation
Duration:	Estimated 22 working days during April-May 2018, including field mission to Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan and Astana, Taraz, Kazakhstan
Terms of Payment:	Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report
Duty station:	Home based with 8 calendar days mission to Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan and Astana and Taraz, Kazakhstan

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the "Enabling Transboundary Cooperation and Integrated Water Resources Management in Chu and Talas River Basins" project.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Chu and Talas River Basi			
GEF Project ID:	00081980		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	00091092	GEF financing:	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Countries:	Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan	IA/EA own:	$300,000	$300,000
Region:	Central Asia	Governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan :	$1,920,000	$1,920,000
Focal Area:	**International Waters**	Other:	$3,579,397	$3,579,397
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	$6,239,397.04	$6,239,397.04
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	$7,239,397.04	$7,239,397.04
Other Partners involved:	UNECE	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		05.05.2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 05.05.2018	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to:

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] 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 on adaptation to climate change and long-term development programmes (WG SAP) from representatives of respective Ministries and Agencies of two countries.

The SAP document was developed by WG SAP and the process was led by the International Consultant on SAP (IC SAP). Several meetings at the national and bilateral levels were held for development of SAP. Two national consultants were also employed to facilitate national meetings on SAP and contribute to development of SAP document under the guidance of the IC SAP.

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

[11] GEF Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme Manual

water quality in Chu and talas River Basins. Capacity Building Programme with participation of experts from Sava River Basin, containing trainings and awareness raising seminars was implemented under this component as well.

The following results were ensured by completion of the project:

- TDA, reflecting key transboundary issues and climate change scenarios and impact, was developed and approved by CTWC;
- 9 CTWC Sessions, considering and approving project related products were supported;
- Two International Conferences and two national seminars, focusing on raising awareness on River Basins' issues, including on climate change scenarios and impacts were held under the support of the project. The set of materials on the base of the TDA, experience of the International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC) and situation analysis in Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Central Asia were produced;
- The Working Group on adaptation to climate change and long-term development programmes was established with the aim to develop the SAP for Chu and Talas River Basins;
- WG SAP developed the SAP document, which is to be presented to 24th Session of CTWC on February 2018;
- Analysis of needs for amendments and changes to the Agreement and Charter on CTWC was produced, resulting in the decision to incorporate Secretariats of CTWC as of legal entities in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan and with reflection of needs for amending the Agreement in SAP document;
- Review of the best adaptable practices from Sava River Basin;
- Working Group on Environment (WGE) under the Secretariat of CTWC was established under the recommendation of the project and 5 meetings of the WGE were supported by project;
- Capacity Building Need Assessment was developed and used in designing and development of the Capacity Building Programme;
- The Study Tour to Sava River Basin for 14 representatives of CTWC and Key Stakeholder Institutions from Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan was organised on May 2016;
- CTWC web-site has been developed at http://chui.at.kg/ru/. It includes the separate project web-page (pending);
- TDA Report with the thematic Annex on Climate Change, Brochure on SAP are to be published by April 2018
- Joint Water Quality Assessment based on agreed collection of samples were produced jointly by Kazhydromet and Kyrgyzhydromet;
- Comparative Report of the Systems of Water Quality Monitoring was produced jointly by Kazhydromet and Kyrgyzhydromet;
- Guidelines for Joint Water Quality Assessment in Chu and Talas River Basins, and Hydrometeorological Indicators was produced;
- Joint Report of Kazhydromet and Kyrgyzhydromet on Selected Hydrometeorological Indicators was produced
- The set of training materials for seven regional trainings based on the experience of ISRBC and situation analysis in Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Central Asia had been produced;
- Seven regional trainings for CTWC and key stakeholders were held with involvement of trainers with experience in Sava River Basin and local consultants, presenting situational analysis for Chu and Talas River Basin (not completed yet);
- The Concept of Capacity Building of Water Resources Monitoring and Data Exchange Systems in Chu and Talas River Basins was developed by International Consultants from Sava River Basin (pending);
- The draft Programme (policy) on data and information exchange of CTWC, including procedures of data and information exchange on CTWC web-site was developed and proposed to the consideration of 25th Session of CTWC (pending).

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have been developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Key stakeholders:

- 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 evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	

3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[2]

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report (Annex F) must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

[2] A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kyrgyzstan. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 22 days according to the following indicative plan:

Activity	Timing (indicative)	Completion Date (indicative)
Preparation (desk review)	4 days (April, 2018)	April 5, 2018
Evaluation Mission (in-country field visits, interviews and presentation of preliminary findings)	8 days (April, 2018)	April 16, 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	6 days (April, 2018)	April 27, 2018
Final Report	4 days (May, 2018)	May 4, 2018

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission. (by April 5, 2018)	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and Project
Presentation	Initial Findings	Last day of the field mission (Monday, April 16, 2018)	Project Team, UNDP CO and key stakeholders, members of Project Board
Draft Final Report	Draft evaluation report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within two weeks time after the field mission (by April 27, 2018)	Project team, CO, reviewed by RTA, GEF OFP
Final Report*	Final report addressing and integrating feedback and comments	Within a week time after receiving comments on the draft (by May 5, 2018)	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See Annex G for an evaluation clearance form and an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects.* The international Consultant has responsibility over submission of a final report. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The project will provide an interpreter to accompany the international consultant during the mission to Kyrgyzstan.

The International Consultant must present the following qualifications:

- A Master's degree in natural science. Academic Degree in related science is an asset;
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience in the fields of International Waters;
- 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;
- Experience in working in Central Asian or CIS countries will be an asset;
- Fluency in English. Knowledge of Russian is an asset.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

%	Milestone
100%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications as per Procurement Notice by March 20,2018 together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: 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. 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	The TDA of the Chu and Talas Basins prepared jointly by the two countries, identifying	At the moment there is not common understanding over	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

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.	issues of transbundary concern.	transboundary issues in Chu-Talas river basins among the stakeholders in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan			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.
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	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	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.

environment in the basin.		climate variability and change.			
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	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

for the involvement of stakeholders in the decision making proces. *Outcome 8*: Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally					
	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,	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	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.

and their variability in the two basins.		procedures for monitoring the quantity and quality of water resources.			
Outcome 10: Countries capacity built for improved coordinated monitoring. *Outcome 11*: Consensus on joint monitoring activities between the two countries.	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.

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

General documentation

- UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
- UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;
- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects;
- GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations.

Project documentation

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF) and Log Frame Analysis
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted;
- Project sites, highlighting suggested visits;
- Project document;
- Annual Work Plans;
- Annual Project Reports;
- Project Implementation Review;
- GEF Operational Quarterly Reports;
- Midterm Review Report (MTR);
- Management response to MTE;
- Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs);
- Project budget and financial data;
- Inception report;
- Project Board Meeting minutes;
- Knowledge and legislation related products.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) ***Impact Ratings:*** 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[3]

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: _____

[33]www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[4]

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[5])

1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated[6])

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

[4]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[5] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[6] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Guidelines for conducting Terminal evaluations: http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905.

- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- 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
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Co-financing table
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____