

**I. Job Information**

Job title:	International Consultant for mid-term review of EU Water Project
Type of contract:	IC contract; Independent mid-term review of the UNDP project
Project Title/Department:	Sustainable Development Cluster, UNDP Uzbekistan
Location:	Home based with one trip to Uzbekistan including field visits to selected regions (Fergana, Syrdarya, Samarkand, Karshi and Khorezm)
Duration of the service:	25 working days (period of April-June 2018) 7 w.d. Desk work in country of residence (period of April 2 – 13, 2018); 9 w.d. Mission to Uzbekistan (April 16 – 25, 2018); 9 w.d. Desk work in country of residence (period of April 30 – May 27, 2018)
Reports to:	Head of the Sustainable Development Cluster, UNDP Uzbekistan

II. Background Information

UNDP Uzbekistan implements the Component 2 on “Technical Capacity Building” (hereinafter Project) of the “Sustainable Management of Water Resources in rural areas in Uzbekistan” Programme funded by the European Union. The Project is implemented jointly with the Ministry of Agriculture and Water resources of Uzbekistan (MAWR) and aims at strengthening institutional frameworks and technical capacities for water management at basin, water user association and farm levels while increasing awareness on efficient management and use of water resources.

The project has three interlinked components:

- Component 1: National Policy Framework for Water Governance and Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM);
- Component 2: Technical Capacity Building;
- Component 3: Awareness Raising.

Expected project Output: Water management services, practices and techniques are strengthened and harmonized within a national framework.

For reaching the above-mentioned output change, the project aims to achieve the following activity results:

Activity result 1: Enhanced capacities of national entities in charge of training provision;

Activity result 2: Strengthened organizational set-up of the water management players and improved advisory mechanisms for improved water supply services;

Activity result 3: Development and implementation of a unified model and approach of capacity building for water management players;

Activity result 4: Enhanced links and networks with EU institutions and practitioners;

Activity result 5: Piloting community development plans with water management as a cross cutting issue.

A list of project's pilot sites is given in the Annex B to this ToR.

The project contributes to UNDAF 2016-2020 and CPD 2016-2020 outcome: *By 2020, rural population benefit from sustainable management of natural resources and resilience to disasters and climate.*

As per the Description of the Action of the "Technical Capacity Building" Component of the EU Program, the Project is subject to mid-term review (MTR) at the mid-point of its implementation. The MTR will determine the progress being made toward the achievement of project 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 final half of the project's term. The organization and timing of the mid-term review will be confirmed after consultation between the Sustainable Development Cluster (SDC) of UNDP CO in Uzbekistan and the Consultant.

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. Functions / Scope of work

Evaluation objectives and scope

The MTR offers the opportunity to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned, and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project implementation and approach. The MTR is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring, and to allow course correction as necessary. To this end, the MTR will serve to:

- Strengthen the management and monitoring functions of the project;
- Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
- Contribute to organizational and development learning;
- Enable informed decision-making;
- Assess the sustainability of the project's interventions;
- Create the basis for replicating successful project results achieved so far.

In addition, and of particular importance, the MTR process will create a forum for dialogue and focused consideration, among the project's partners and stakeholders, of the progress made thus far on achieving the objectives, but also on the overall approach to project implementation.

This evaluation to be done in line with the evaluation policy of UNDP (<http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>) and the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>).

Objectives of the mid-term evaluation are the following:

- Review the project's relevance to national priorities and provide recommendations for adjustment as needed;
- Review the progress towards achievement of Project objective and outcomes as set out in Document, results framework and other related documents;
- Assess potential contribution of the project 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 project 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 project 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 project interventions;
- Critically analyse project implementation and management arrangements including inter-agency cooperation;
- List and document lessons concerning the project design, implementation and management.

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

The MTR will cover several 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.

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 project is promoting ownership and meeting the needs of stakeholders
- 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
- Whether the project's measures to address gender inequalities and women's empowerment are relevant and producing the intended effect

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 project interventions in a cost-effective manner
- Whether there is efficiency in the coordination and communication processes between stakeholders and partners of the project

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

- Whether the management structure of the project, the distribution of responsibilities, and coordination mechanisms are appropriate for the achievement of project objectives
- 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

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

- Whether the project is making an expected contribution to capacity development
- 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;

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.

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

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the project team and key stakeholders including government counterparts, donors and development partners, and targeted groups, with a special focus on irrigated agriculture. The Consultant is expected to conduct a field mission to pilot regions to review the project implementation progress. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Beneficiaries:

- Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources
- Pilot Basin Irrigation System Authorities
- Pilot Water Users Associations
- Pilot Communities in 6 regions.

Partners:

- Government Agencies (State Committee for Ecology and Environment, Uzhydromet center and Uzhozvodnadzor Inspection, Ministry of Finance);
- Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Engineers of Mechanization in Agriculture and Irrigation and Water Problems Institute;
- International and regional agencies (EUD, GIZ, UNESCO, CAREC, SDC)

The MTR may be undertaken using a combination of techniques and data sources, including:

- Desk review of all relevant project documentation;
- Consultations and interviews with stakeholders and partners;
- Questionnaires;
- Other methods as appropriate and feasible

The Consultant will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, annual project progress reports, project budget revisions, project board meeting minutes, project files, UNDAF 2016-2020, CPD 2016-2020, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A comprehensive list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator will be additionally shared with evaluator after contract signing.

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:	<i>rating</i>	2. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Capacity development of stakeholders	
Effectiveness		Financial resources	
Efficiency		Policy and regulatory frameworks	
Overall Project 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 Review will be conducted by using methodologies and techniques suitable for the evaluation purpose, objective and evaluation questions as described in this TOR. The Consultant, 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 Review 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;
- Project Document, Progress Reports, Annual Work Plans and Progress Reports, Project Quality Assurance reports, minutes of the Project Board meetings, and other materials from the previous interventions in the region;
- Analytical and knowledge products prepared within the framework of the project;

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

- Relevant departments of the Ministry of Water Resources;
- Government Agencies (the State Committee for Ecology and Environment, Uzhydromet Center and Uzhozvodnadzor Inspection, and Ministry of Finance);
- Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Engineers of Mechanization in Agriculture and Irrigation;
- Water Problems Institute;

- International and regional agencies (EUD, GIZ, UNESCO, CAREC, SDC);
- Pilot Basin Irrigation System Authorities
- Pilot Water Users Associations
- Pilot Communities in 6 regions.

In all cases, International Consultant/Evaluator is expected to analyze all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, project 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 review. The International Consultant/Evaluator will make sure that the voices, opinions, and information of targeted citizens and participants of the project 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 project partners and applicable to the remaining period of the project.

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:

- Manage the process of mid-term review;
- Design the detailed Mid-Term review 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 project for creation of an enabling environment for promoting effective water resources management in pilot regions;
- Draft the Inception Report and share with UNDP for acceptance;
- Draft the Mid-Term review report and share with the key stakeholders for comments;
- Finalize the Mid-Term review report based on the inputs from key stakeholders.

The International Consultant/Evaluator will receive support of UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan and the project team as needed.

The International Consultant/Evaluator will be the author of the Mid-term review report.

The International Consultant/Evaluator is expected to work intermittently during April – June 2018 period which include **9 days** mission to Uzbekistan (Tashkent and provinces) and desk work prior and after the mission.

It is expected that the International Consultant/Evaluator will conduct field visits to selected project sites. The project 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. Deliverable OUTPUTS AND DEADLINES

The following tentative schedule of deliverables is expected under the current assignment. The Sustainable Development Cluster of UNDP Uzbekistan reserves the right, if necessary, to amend the terms of reference of an expert upon a written agreement. The final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of the assignment. All deliverables should be submitted to UNDP SD Cluster in electronic form by the Consultant in English.

#	Deliverables/Outputs	Deadline	Installments	%
---	----------------------	----------	--------------	---

Education:	Undergraduate or higher degree in a relevant discipline e.g. water resources management, natural resources management or environmental sciences.
Work experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work experience in the field of water resources management, natural resources or environmental management for at least 5 years with government, international development organizations or private sector; - Experience in training, professional development and continuous education of water or environment industry professionals, and knowledge of relevant international best-practices; - Proven track record of application of results-based management evaluation methodologies to development programs/projects in areas of water management or environmental management including gender sensitive evaluations; - Good knowledge of IWRM; - Experience working in Central Asia and/or CIS regions would be an asset; - Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.
Language Requirements:	Fluent English communication and writing skills, knowledge of Russian/Uzbek would be an asset
Others:	Demonstrable analytical skills; Excellent communication skills.

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified female candidates, people with disabilities, and minorities are highly encouraged to apply.

XI. Signatures - Post Description Certification		
Incumbent:		
Name:	Signature	Date
Supervisor:		
Hurshid Rustamov Head of Sustainable Development Cluster, UNDP Uzbekistan	Signature	Date
Prepared by:		
Gaukhar Kudaybergenova SDC Programme Associate, UNDP Uzbekistan	Signature	Date
Cleared by:		
Dilfuza Nabieva CO M&E Focal Point, UNDP Uzbekistan	Signature	Date

ToR ANNEX A: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP project financed by EU
 - Project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - 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
 - 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

¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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

ToR ANNEX B: List of project pilot sites

Following pilot sites of the project are located in six regions:

Fergana region

Basin level: "Syrdarya-Sokh" Basin Irrigation System Authorities (BISA)

Irrigation System level: "Isfayram-Shokhimardon" Irrigation System Authorities (ISA)

Water Users level: "Zarmurob Turgunboy" and "Musajon Ismoilov" Water Users Associations (AWP), canals "Zarkent" and "Kuchatchilik"

Community: Zarkent and Guliston villages

Syrdarya region

Basin level: "Lower-Syrdarya" BISA

Irrigation System level: "Shoruzak-Syrdarya" ISA, canal "Soyibobod"

WUA level: "Yuksalish" WUA, canal "Yuksalish"

Community: Soyibobod village

Samarkand Region

Basin level: "Zarafshan" BISA

Irrigation System level: "Mirzapay" ISA, canal "Praviy-Mirza-Pay"

WUA level: "Hujabuston" WUA, canal Hujabuston

Community: Kupaki village

Kashkadarya Region

Basin level: "Amu-Kahkadarya" BISA

Irrigation System: "Karshi Main Canal" ISA, canal "KMK"

WUA level: "Shirkent Omon Tepa" WUA, Canal "R-19"

Community: Kovchin village

Surkhandarya Region

Basin level: "Amu-Surkhan" BISA

Irrigation System: Surkhan-Sherabad ISA

WUA level: "Takkashkon Kelajagi" WUA, canal "R-20"

Community: Bogobod village.

Khorezm Region

Basin level: "Lower-Amudarya" BISA

Irrigation System: "Shavat-Kulavat" ISA, canal "Daryolik Arna"

WUA level: "Buzqala" WUA

Community: Qadriyat village