



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

ANNEX-1

I. JOB INFORMATION	
Position Title:	International Consultant/Evaluator (Mid-Term Evaluation)
Type:	Individual Contract (International)
Project Title/Department:	UN Joint Programme "Building the resilience of communities affected by the Aral Sea disaster through a Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund for the Aral Sea Region"/ Sustainable Development Cluster
Duration of the service:	20 working days (within the period of June-July 2018) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 5 w.d. desk work in country of residence (June 4-8, 2018)• 5 w.d. Mission to Uzbekistan (3 w.d. in Tashkent, 2 w.d. in Nukus, excluding weekend days) (June 14-20, 2018)• 10 w.d. Desk work in country of residence (July 2-13, 2018)
Work status (full time / part time):	Part-time
Duty station:	Home-based with one mission to Uzbekistan (Tashkent and Nukus, Republic of Karakalpakstan)
Reports to:	Head of Sustainable Development Cluster, UNDP Uzbekistan

II. BACKGROUND
<p>Human security is a dynamic and practical policy framework for addressing widespread and cross-cutting threats faced by governments and people. Human security calls for an assessment of human insecurities that is people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and preventive. The application of human security derives much of its strength from dual policy framework based on mutually reinforcing pillars of protection and empowerment. Application of this framework offers comprehensive approach that combines top-down norms, processes and institutions with bottom-up focus in which participatory processes support the important role of people as actors in defining and implementation their essential freedom.</p> <p>The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS), launched by the Government of Japan and the United Nations Secretariat in March 1999, finances Joint Programmes carried out by organizations in the UN system, and when appropriate, in partnership with non-UN entities, to advance the operational impact of the human security concept. The UNTFHS places priority on promoting multi-sectoral and inter-agency integration based on the comparative advantage of the applying organizations and through their collaboration.</p> <p>Capitalizing on the successes and lessons learned from the <u>previous UN Joint Programme on "Sustaining livelihoods affected by the Aral Sea disaster" (2012-2016)</u>, four UN Agencies in Uzbekistan (UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA and UNV) in 2016 launched a new UN Joint Programme <u>"Building the resilience of communities affected by the Aral Sea disaster through a Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund for the Aral Sea Region" covering the period of 2016-2019</u>. The Joint Programme is implemented through joint funding from the UNTFHS, participating UN agencies</p>

and Government of Uzbekistan within the framework of UNDAF 2016-2020 and Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2020. Financial portfolio of the project for the period of 2016-2019 is around \$3.6 mln. Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Uzbekistan is the national implementing partner.

The Programme aims to mitigate inter-connected risks to human security and building the resilience of communities affected by the Aral Sea Disaster through an integrated and multi-level approach as well as facilitating sustainable financial support through the establishment of a Multi-Partner Human Security Trust Fund (MPHSTF) for the Aral Sea. The main objectives of the programme are to:

- i) address human security needs of the population affected by the Aral Sea disaster at local and national levels, and
- ii) establish a well-coordinated financial mechanism for implementing and sustainable financing of human security initiatives to promote and mainstream the human security approach in the region through the creation of the MPHSTF for the Aral Sea Region.

The Joint Programme works to further integrate human security concept that proved to be effective in addressing human security challenges faced by individuals and communities affected by the Aral Sea disaster.

As the Programme approaches the midpoint of its implementation, mid-term evaluation is planned to be conducted, and UNDP is recruiting an international consultant to determine the progress being made toward the achievement of Programme outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; will present initial lessons learned about the project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the second half of the Programme's term.

In conducting mid-term review, international consultant will be supported by national evaluation consultant, hereinafter international consultant and national consultant jointly will be referred as evaluation team. National consultant will provide technical support in conducting desk review of documents, data collection, organization of meetings, including focus group discussions as needed, as well as providing support to international consultant in arranging follow-up discussions, if necessary, with key informants after field visits.

The key product expected from the mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report written in English. The mid-term evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

III. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

OBJECTIVE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

This Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is initiated by the UNDP Uzbekistan as a leading agency of UN Joint Programme and aims to provide UN Country team and national partners with a strategy and policy options for more effective and efficient achievement, upscale and replication of the Programme results. Mid-Term Evaluation aims at assessing overall progress towards achieving the Programme objective and outcomes as set out in Programme Document and other related documents. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for UN Joint Programme management and stakeholders.

The MTE to be done in line with the evaluation policy of UNDP (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>) and the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>). MTE is intended to critically assess programme design, progress towards the achievement of results with a particular emphasis on assessment of the programme activities and their consistency with programme's objectives and future plans, identify and document lessons to improve the design and implementation of programme activities and make recommendations for improvement.

Moreover, MTE will play a critical role in future implementation of the Joint Programme through

guidance on: (i) strengthening the adaptive management and monitoring function of the Programme; (ii) ensuring contribution of participating UN agencies in the achievement of Programme objectives; (iii) enhancing organizational and development learning; (iv) enabling informed decision-making and (v) assessing the sustainability of programme interventions.

Objectives of the mid-term evaluation are the following:

- Review the Joint Programme's relevance to national priorities and provide recommendations for adjustment as needed;
- Review the progress towards achievement of Programme objective and outcomes as set out in Programme Document, results framework and other related documents;
- Assess potential contribution of the Joint Programme to the achievement of Outcome results with joint Government of Uzbekistan and UNDP programmatic frameworks of UNDAF 2016-2020 and CPD 2016-2020;
- Assess the degree to which the Joint Programme implementation processes at all levels (community level, policy support, etc.) are being carried out through participatory approach;
- Assess the degree to which the resources and funding for the above Programme directions being used effectively and efficiently;
- Assess the extent to which a knowledge base is being established to build the capacity of key stakeholders to address the relevant development problems;
- Assess sustainability of the Joint Programme interventions.
- Critically analyse Joint Programme implementation and management arrangements including inter-agency cooperation;
- List and document lessons concerning Joint Programme design, implementation and management.

In all above assessment points, **gender equality and women empowerment has to be reflected as a crosscutting issue.**

International consultants, with support of national consultant, is expected to work with key Joint Programme stakeholders, including UN Country Office in Uzbekistan, participating UN agencies, Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Council of Ministers of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, NGOs and farmers and beneficiaries of the Joint Programme.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The MTR will cover a number of aspects of the project. These will include the following: relevance of the project, quality of project design, efficiency of implementation, effectiveness to date, partnership strategy, and potential sustainability of project interventions. It will look at the achievements of the project with respect to the relevance of its objectives and the attainability of its outputs. The MTR will consider the project design, including whether the assumptions and risks remain valid, noting external factors beyond the control of the project that have affected it negatively or positively to date. While it is not an impact evaluation, to the extent possible it should touch upon the long-term effects of this Programme and its potential contribution to UNDAF 2016-2020 and CPD 2016-2020 Output and Outcome level results, based on the information gathered from consultations with various stakeholders and beneficiaries, as well as from desk review of relevant documents and reports.

Special attention shall be paid to the Programme's contribution to gender equality and women empowerment. The report should evaluate **gender mainstreaming** in Programme design and implementation, challenges and achievements in promoting gender equality, recommendations for improvement as well as possible replication.

The MTR should review the *project's conceptual design and relevance*, and whether the outcomes, indicators, targets, risks and assumptions that were agreed upon are still relevant, with attention to:

- Whether the project responds to development priorities at the regional and national level; Whether the intervention is aligned with international instruments (e.g. CEDAW,), standards and principles on gender equality and contributes to their implementation; Whether the intervention is informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analyses that identify underlying causes and barriers to gender equality;
- Whether project's measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and producing the intended effect;
- Whether the project's target groups are systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure project remains relevant to them;

The MTR should review the *effectiveness* of the approach used to produce the project results:

- Whether the project is on track in contributing to the achievement of UNDAF 2016-2020 and CPD 2016-2020 outcome and output level results;
- What are the major factors influencing the achievement of results and how far these results are attributable to UNDP?
- Revisit the underlying factors beyond the Joint Programme's immediate control that influence outcomes and results and assess appropriateness and effectiveness of the Joint Programme's management strategies for these factors;
- What were the main challenges that joint programme faced so far in achieving the results and whether the joint programme came up with innovative solutions to address these challenges;
- Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the Joint Programme document and relevant action plans?
- Revisit Joint Programme's Social and Environmental Screening and assess its validity, additional risks, and possible measures to address them;
- Whether Joint Programme M&E strategy enables measuring the progress towards achievement of results, including SMARTness of indicators, availability of baselines, targets, means of verification, metadata, etc.;
- To what extent gender equality is integrated into the Joint Programme results framework;
- Whether Joint Programme regularly collects six-disaggregated data;
- Whether the logical framework was useful management tool during project implementation and whether any changes were made to it;
- Whether implementation was regularly monitored by collection relevant information/data to track the progress towards achievement of targets;

The MTR should review the *efficiency* of project implementation, with attention to:

- Whether the project is efficient in planning, organizing, and controlling the delivery of Joint Programme interventions in a cost-effective manner;
- Whether adequate resources are being allocated for integrating gender equality in the Joint Programme interventions;
- Whether there is efficiency in the coordination and communication processes between stakeholders and partners of the project;
- Whether the Joint Programme design remains as the most effective option to respond to current development challenges and changes in the context? Is there any way for improving it;
- Whether the management structure of the project, the distribution of responsibilities, and coordination mechanisms remains appropriate for the achievement of project objectives;

- Whether any business practices and financing models contributed to increase the efficiency in delivering as one;
- Whether there is a sound partnership strategy and synergies with other similar projects; identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships for the remainder of the project duration;
- Whether the Joint Programme interventions were complementary to other development partners' interventions;

The MTR should review the potential *sustainability* - the extent to which, based on the project's sustainability strategy, the benefits of the project will continue after it has come to an end, including:

- Whether a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders is being implemented;
- Whether the results that Joint Programme is achieving/contributing are sustainable?
- Whether the Joint Programme interventions are advancing institutional change to systematically address gender equality concerns;
- Whether the Joint Programme promoting ownership and creating capacities, including organizational arrangements for sustained results at all relevant levels;
- Whether the project is contributing to the availability of policy and regulatory framework that will support continuation of benefits;
- Whether the project has the potential to be replicated based on implementation progress so far, and whether any steps are being taken by the project to do so; whether there are specific good practices that can be replicated and what has made them successful;

Findings and lessons learned:

- Outline, as logically and objectively as possible, findings and conclusions, with an emphasis on findings related to the project's approach to incorporating gender issues;
- Highlight the major problems, shortcomings, and weaknesses in order of importance;

Recommendations:

- Present recommendations for corrective actions; recommendations should be objective, realistic, practical, understandable and forward looking;
- Link the recommendations logically to the findings;
- Recommend a realistic duration for implementation of remaining project activities;
- Suggest new project activities for the remaining part of project implementation as deemed necessary

Given that this is a Mid-Term Review, the emphasis will be on identifying lessons learnt, with a view to adjusting the project design and implementation accordingly. The MTR will therefore make recommendations for the way forward, based on progress thus far.

IV. EVALUATION RATING AND CRITERIA:

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and gender mainstreaming**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Assessment of intervention:	rating	2. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Capacity development of stakeholders	
Effectiveness		Financial resources	
Efficiency		Policy and regulatory frameworks	

Overall Programme Outcome rating		Overall likelihood of sustainability	
3. Monitoring and Evaluation:	<i>rating</i>	4. Gender mainstreaming	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		GM strategy at entry	
M&E plan implementation		GM at implementation	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of GM	

The evaluator is expected to use below rating scale in assessing the evaluation criteria:

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

V. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY:

The Mid-Term Evaluation will be conducted by using methodologies and techniques suitable for the evaluation purpose, objective and evaluation questions as described in this TOR. The Evaluator, in consultation with UNDP and other stakeholders, will determine the specific design and methods for the exercise during the initial inception period and outline the detailed methodology in the inception report prepared. Inception report and Mid-Term Evaluation report should clearly outline, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

The International Consultant/Evaluator as reference materials can use the following documents to be found via www.undp.org :

- UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
- UNDP M&E Resource Kit
- UNDP Evaluation Policy

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS:

Data for the report will be collected through various means, including the following:

Desk reviews: The evaluator will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following:

- Action Strategy of the Government of Uzbekistan for 2017-2021; Action-oriented Roadmap on Further Cooperation between Uzbekistan and the United Nations System for 2017-2020;
- UNDP Strategic Plans 2014-2017, 2018-2021; UNDAF 2016-2020, including joint workplans for 2016-2017 and 2018-2020; CPD 2016-2020 and Results Oriented Annual Reports for 2016-2017;
- Corporate and country level strategic documents of UNESCO, UNFPA and UNV;
- UN Joint Programme Project Document, Progress Reports, Annual Work Plans and Progress Reports, Joint Programme Quality Assurance reports, minutes of the Joint Programme Board meetings, and other materials from the previous interventions in the region;
- Final Evaluation for the first UN Joint Programme (2012-2016);
- Analytical and knowledge products prepared within the framework of UN Joint Programme;

Discussions with the relevant programme and project staff of participating UN agencies: The evaluation team will be working and consulting the evaluation exercise with relevant teams on continuous basis. Debriefing meeting with the heads of participating UN agencies will also be

carried out to inform on the review and evaluation processes as well as share any preliminary observations as necessary.

Stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions: The evaluation team will conduct interviews with following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Relevant departments of the Ministry of Economy;
- Government agencies (Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Council of Ministers of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Karakalpakstan);
- The International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea, Charity Fund for Aral Gene Pool Protection;
- Donor community representatives (Swiss Cooperation Agency, MASHAV, MSF, JICA);
- Local NGOs and Community-based Organizations in the target districts, including (representatives of district Makhalla Fund, Business Women’s Association, representatives from target communities in pilot districts);

In all cases, International Consultant/Evaluator is expected to analyze all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, Joint Programme documents, mission reports, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. International Consultant/Evaluator is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and qualitative tools as means to collect data for the mid-term evaluation. The International Consultant/Evaluator will make sure that the voices, opinions, and information of targeted citizens and participants of the Joint Programme are taken into account.

The International Consultant/Evaluator must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by the Joint Programme partners and applicable to the remaining period of the Joint Programme.

VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR

The **International Consultant/Evaluator** will work under the guidance of the Head of the Sustainable Development Cluster. The International Consultant/Evaluator’s main tasks will consist of the following duties and responsibilities:

- Lead and manage the process of mid-term evaluation jointly with national evaluation expert;
- Design the detailed Mid-Term Evaluation methodology and plan;
- Conduct desk-reviews, interviews and site-visits to obtain objective and verifiable data to substantive evaluation ratings and assessments on adequacy of the level and proposed modes of enforcement of the regulatory and programmatic documents developed within the Joint Programme for creation of an enabling environment for promoting human security in the region;
- Draft the Inception Report and share with UNDP for acceptance;
- Draft the Mid-Term Evaluation report and share with the key stakeholders for comments;
- Finalize the Mid-Term Evaluation report based on the inputs from key stakeholders.

The International Consultant/Evaluator will be supported by national consultant who will assist in reviewing the relevant documents, preparing an inception report, interviewing the stakeholders, drafting reports and briefing the stakeholders on the progress, key findings and recommendations. The International Consultant/Evaluator will receive support of UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan and Joint Programme Team as needed.

In the process of the preparation for the Mid-Term Evaluation, the International Consultant/Evaluator will have to thoroughly study the **outcomes of the Final Evaluation for the first UN Joint Programme¹ (2012-2016)** that was conducted in December 2015-January 2016, and define to what degree the findings and recommendations were addressed in developing and implementing current UN Joint Programme. To elaborate on the international best-practices in the application of the Human Security approach, the International Consultant/Evaluator will also study

¹ <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/8081>

the findings and recommendations of rapid **assessment conducted by UNIVERSALIA²** during January –May 2013, which has also covered the first UN Joint Programme. International Consultant/Evaluator will have to also study the report findings and evaluate, document and develop recommendations on further up scaling the human security approach in the context of the country. The International Consultant/Evaluator will be the author of the Mid-term Evaluation report.

The International Consultant/Evaluator is expected to work intermittently during June-July 2018 period which include **one-week** mission to Uzbekistan (Tashkent and Nukus) and desk work prior and after the mission.

It is expected that the International Consultant/Evaluator will conduct field visits to selected Joint Programme sites. The Joint Programme team will provide full support and ensure necessary arrangements for smooth implementation of the field visits. Remuneration of the International Consultant/Evaluator will be determined based on qualifications and experience using UN rates for consultancy services.

VII. EXPECTED OUTCOME:

The International Consultant/Evaluator is expected to deliver the following deliverables in English to UNDP:

- **Inception Report** (to be submitted prior to the evaluation mission to Uzbekistan). The report should be based on the documentation review and analysis, as well as necessary discussion in relation to the evaluation with relevant staff of UNDP. The inception report will describe the conceptual framework the consultant to be used in undertaking the evaluation, and set out in details the evaluation methodology. The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be agreed with UNDP. In its turn UNDP will share and agree the draft inception report with the government and UN agencies. The report should also contain a work plan and a proposed table of content of the final report.
- **Draft Evaluation Report** upon the in-country mission for subsequent circulation to the key Joint Programme stakeholders for comments. The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report with an executive summary of no more than 5 pages, that includes a brief description of the Joint Programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft report will be shared with the UN agencies and national partners to seek their comments and suggestions. Proposed content of the report is presented in Annex-1 to this TOR.
- **Final Evaluation Report** The final report will be 40-50 pages in length and will take into account the outcomes of the discussions and comments made by UNDP, participating UN agencies and national partners. The final report will be sent to the UN agencies and national partners.

VII. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Main actors involved in the implementation of the evaluation include UNDP, Joint Programme Team, key stakeholders with following responsibilities:

UNDP as a leading UN agency of the Joint Programme and commissioner of the Mid-Term Evaluation will have the following functions:

- Lead the Mid-Term Evaluation process throughout the evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination);
- Convene the Mid-Term Evaluation reference group;
- Lead the finalization of the Mid-Term Evaluation ToR;
- Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the International Consultant/Evaluator and make contractual arrangements to hire the International Consultant/Evaluator;

² <https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/HSU/FINAL%20-%20UNTFHS%20Rapid%20Assessment%20-%20Overview%20Report.pdf>

- Ensure the Mid-Term Evaluation products meet quality standards;
- Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process;
- Take responsibility for dissemination;
- Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the Mid-Term Evaluation within the Joint Programme budgets.

The Joint Programme Team will have the following functions:

- Provide the evaluation team with administrative and logistical support, including for the field mission, and required data;
- Connect the evaluation team with key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a full inclusive and transparent approach to the Mid-Term Evaluation;

The Joint Programme stakeholders and partners will serve as the Mid-Term Evaluation reference group. The reference group will have the following functions:

- Review the draft Mid-Term Evaluation report and ensure final draft meets all agreed objectives and requirements;
- Facilitate the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and partners who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
- Oversee progress and conduct of the Mid-Term Evaluation the quality of the process and the product;
- Contribute to dissemination of the results of the Mid-Term Evaluation.

VIII. EVALUATION ETHICS

All evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' (<http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>). These guidelines apply to International Consultant/Evaluator undertaking the Mid-Term Evaluation described in this TOR.

IX. DELIVERABLES AND TIMEFRAME

The following schedule of deliverables is expected under the current assignment. The final schedule will be agreed in the beginning of the assignment. All deliverables should be submitted to UNDP CO in electronic form by the International Consultant/Evaluator in English.

Outputs/Deliverables	Due date	Instalments
<p>1. Inception Report, the report should be based on the documentation review and analysis, as well as necessary discussion in relation to the mid-term evaluation with relevant staff of UNDP (email, skype). The inception report will describe the conceptual framework to be used in undertaking the mid-term evaluation, and set out in details the mid-term evaluation methodology. The methodology and techniques to be used in the mid-term evaluation should be agreed upon with UNDP, who will share the draft inception report with the government and UN agencies. The report should also contain a work plan and a proposed table of content of the final report (weight of output 1: 20%)</p>	June 11, 2018	1 st installment (40%)
<p>2. Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report, upon the in-country mission for subsequent circulation to the key Joint Programme stakeholders for comments. The draft report will contain the same sections as</p>	June 27, 2018	

the final report with an executive summary of no more than 5 pages, that includes a brief description of the Joint Programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the mid-term evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft report will be shared with the UN agencies and national partners to seek their comments and suggestions (weight of output 2: 20%)		
3. Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report , the final report will be 50 pages in length and will take into account the outcomes of the discussions from the workshop and comments made by UNDP, participating UN agencies and national partners. The final report will be sent to the UN agencies and national partners (weight of output 3: 60%)	July 16, 2018	2nd installment (60%)

Payment will be made in lump sum in two installments upon completion of the tasks/works indicated in the TOR outputs/deliverables and their acceptance by the Head of Sustainable Development Cluster, UNDP Uzbekistan

1st instalment (Output 1 and 2): 40 % of total payment

2nd installment (Output 3): 60% of total payment

Total duration of the assignment will be 20 working days. The Mid-Term Evaluation mission to Uzbekistan will take place in May 2018. The following tentative timetable is recommended for the Mid-Term Evaluation; however, the final schedule will be agreed upon at the beginning of the consultancy assignment.

#	Activities	Tentative timeframe	Working days
1	Desk review, development of methodology and inception report (home base)	2 nd week of June 2018	5 days
2	Mission to Uzbekistan, including briefings/debriefings, meetings with UNDP, UN participating agencies, in-country field visits, interviews: Tashkent – 3 days; Nukus – 2 days	3 rd and 4 th week of June 2018	5 days
3	Drafting of the Mid-Term Evaluation report	1 st and 2 nd weeks of July 2018	6 days
4	Finalization of the Mid-Term Evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) (home base)	3 rd week of July 2018	4 days
	Total days		20 days

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to UNDP CO, UN participating agencies, government counterparts and Joint Programme management. All comments and suggestions (if any) shall be addressed and the report will be considered as the final deliverable as soon it is accepted by UNDP. The final version of the Mid-Term Evaluation report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan (Mr. Hurshid Rustamov, address: Uzbekistan, 100015, Tashkent, Mirabad str., 41/3, tel. +998 71 1203450; fax +998 71 1203485, e-mail: hurshid.rustamov@undp.org) no later than May 31st, 2018.

X. Payment Conditions

Payments are based upon outputs, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR and acceptance by Hiring Manager. Payment will be released in 2 instalments as described in the **Part IX** of the TOR.

Note: This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and other related costs including the travels, DSAs, if any, required to produce the above deliverables.

XI. Qualification Requirements

Education:	Advanced university degree in economics, public/business administration, development studies or any other social science related field;
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General practical experience of at least 4 years in any of the following areas: sustainable livelihood, area based development program, rural development and human security approach; - At least 5 years of specific experience with evaluation methodologies, results-based monitoring; experience within UN system. Previous experience in professional consultancy, conducting evaluations of Joint Programmes in the area of socio-economic development; - Work experience in the countries of the RBEC region, specifically in the Central Asian region <i>specifically in Uzbekistan</i>; - Knowledge of the country context. - Knowledge of gender analysis and mainstreaming is an asset;
Language Requirements:	Excellent English communication and writing skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset
Others:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent writing and analytical skills - Strong communication skills, client-orientation, ability to work in a team; - Initiative, analytical judgment, ability to work under pressure, ethics and honesty; - Advanced ability to use IT equipment and software.

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.

XII. Signatures - Post Description Certification

Incumbent (if applicable)		
Name	Signature 	Date May 2, 2018
UNDP Head of the Sustainable Development Cluster		
Mr. Hurshid Rustamov	Signature 	Date 8.05.2018
Prepared by:		
Elvira Izamova SDC Programme Associate, UNDP Uzbekistan	Signature 	Date 07.05.2018.
Cleared by:		
Dilfuza Nabieva CO M&E focal point, UNDP Uzbekistan	Signature 	Date

Proposed structure of the mid-term evaluation report:**I. Executive summary (5 pages long a stand-alone section)**

- Brief description of the Joint Programme
- Context and purpose of the evaluation, including audience for the evaluation and intended use;
- Key aspects of evaluation approach and methods;
- Summarized principle findings, conclusions and recommendations

II. Introduction

- Joint Programme background and rationale for conducting this evaluation;
- Context and purpose of the evaluation, and key questions to be addressed;
- Primary audience of the evaluation and intended use of evaluation results;
- Structure and content of the report;

III. Description of the Joint Programme and its development context

- Joint Programme objectives, intended development change, and target groups;
- Results framework, implementation strategies and key assumptions;
- Linkages with national priorities, UNDAF/CPD priorities, corporate strategies;
- Key partners involved in the implementation and their role;
- Scale of intervention, including size of the target population to be reached through different components of the Joint Programme;
- Total resources, including human resources and budgets;
- Social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the Joint Programme operates and effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes;
- Description of design weaknesses (e.g. intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g. resource limitations);

IV. Evaluation scope and objectives

- Evaluation scope – parameters of the evaluation, including time period, segments of the target population, geographic area, Joint Programme components, outputs or outcomes that were and were not assessed;
- Evaluation objectives – spell out the types of decisions evaluations users will make, issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions;
- Evaluation criteria – explain evaluation criteria and performance standards;
- Evaluation questions – main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explanation of how these questions address the information needs of users;

V. Evaluation approach, methods and data analysis

- Data sources;
- Sample and sampling frame;
- Data collection procedures and instruments;
- Performance standards;
- Stakeholder engagement;
- Ethical considerations;
- Background information on evaluators;
- Major limitations of the methodology and data analysis;

VI. Findings – statement of facts based on analysis of the data in following structure:

- Conceptual design and relevance;
- Effectiveness;
- Efficiency;
- Sustainability;

VII. Conclusions – comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the Joint Programme. Conclusions should be logically connected to the findings and follow the same flow:

- Conceptual design and relevance;
- Effectiveness;