



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

I. Position Information

Position Title:	National Consultant/Evaluator
Type:	Individual Contract
Project Title/Department:	UNDP/GEF project "Market Transformation for Sustainable Rural Housing in Uzbekistan"/Sustainable Development Cluster
Duration of the service:	30 working days during the period from October – 15 December 2020
Work Status:	Part-time
Duty station:	Home based
Expected travel site:	
Reports to:	Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point) in Country Office, UNDP Uzbekistan

II. Background

The objective of UNDP/GEF and the Ministry of Construction of the Republic of Uzbekistan project "Market Transformation for Sustainable Rural Housing in Uzbekistan" is to support the Government of Uzbekistan in provision of rural population in the country with improved, affordable and environmentally friendly living conditions. The project design builds directly on previous and ongoing experience with sustainable, low-carbon and climate-resilient local development in Uzbekistan. Specifically, the project aims at lowering the energy intensity trajectory of Uzbekistan by promoting the construction of new energy-efficient and low-carbon rural housing.

The project consists of four inter-linked outcomes. The first outcome is the establishment of the green mortgage scheme to incentivize and eventually scale-up the demand for low-carbon housing. This outcome will be supported and enabled by three complementary outcomes related to strengthening domestic supply chain and capacities for construction of low-carbon housing (Outcome 2), introducing policies and regulations for low-carbon housing and settlements (Outcome 3) and raising public awareness about benefits and advantages of low-carbon housing (Outcome 4).

The Project is planned for six years (April 2017 – April 2023), and its planned budget amounts to \$136,665,099, including \$6,300,000 (GEF and UNDP) and \$130,365,099 co-financing. It covers pilot sites in all regions of Uzbekistan. Project stakeholders include the Ministry of Construction as the national partner implementing agency, other relevant government agencies, regional and local administrations, self-governments, banking sector, academia and NGOs, private sector and rural homebuyers and homeowners, multilateral international organizations.

Under the overall supervision of the Leader of Sustainable Development Cluster, the National Consultant will be responsible for conducting the Midterm Review (MTR) of the UNDP-GEF project "Market Transformation for Sustainable Rural Housing in Uzbekistan" (PIMS 5392) jointly implemented by the UNDP and Ministry of Construction of Uzbekistan. MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (http://gef.undp.org/uploads/H-Jk1_dCXqGgaPG4BlccvA/Guidance_for_Conducting_Midterm_Reviews_of_UNDP-Supported_GEF-Financed_Projects_Final_June_2014.pdf), and shall be conducted through fulfilling the following tasks.

III. Functions / Key Outputs Expected

I. Objective of the Mid-Term Review

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

II. MTR Approach & Methodology

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the executing agencies, senior officials and project team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. ((Ministry of Construction, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Economy, State Committee for Land, Geodesy, Cartography and State Cadastre, Centre of Hydro-meteorological Service under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, State Committee for Ecology and Environment Protection, Chamber of Commerce and Industries of Uzbekistan, central and local authorities in rural regions, self-government bodies such as makhallas and village councils, and local communities). Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions (subject to COVID lockdown restrictions for travels to regions lifted) to the 2 project pilot regions of Bukhara and Samarkand, including the following project sites: low-carbon massifs of affordable rural housing in each pilot region.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

III. Detailed Scope of the MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#) for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its timeframe?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Mid-term Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Mid-term Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be	Red= Not on target to be
-----------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

achieved

achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project

decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the UNDP-GEF full-sized project titled "Market Transformation for Sustainable Rural Housing in Uzbekistan"

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

IV. Deliverables and timeframe

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 working days during the period from August – 15 October 2020 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
25 August 2020: 9 w/days	Report on inputs/support provided to and accepted by the International Consultant/Evaluator in development of draft MTR report
August – September 2020: 10 w/days	MTR mission: Video interviews will commence at the end of August and early in September 2020. Due to COVID-19, decision is made that all interviews will be conducted through videoconferencing tool on a Zoom platform.
2 October – 12 October 2020; 10w/days	Preparing draft report

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

12 October, 1 w/day	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	
27 October 2020	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	
27 October 2020	Expected date of full MTR completion	

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission (subject to COVID lockdown restrictions for travels to regions lifted): 16 October 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
2	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 27 October 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

IV. MTR Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning UNIT is the Resource Management Unit in Country Office, UNDP Uzbekistan (Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point)).

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

V. Team Composition

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The *Local Consultant* will provide input in reviewing all the project-relevant documentation and provide the *International Consultant -Team Leader* with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the Local Consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Review the original documents;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Organize the mission program, arrange and facilitate meetings with key stakeholders;
- Provide regular translation/interpretation as necessary;
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report, as relevant;
- Assist the International Team Leader in finalizing the draft report by incorporating inputs received;
- Provide other support services for the International Team Leader.

VI. Timeframe and fees

The following deliverables and indicative schedule are expected from the consultancy contract.

Exact dates of beginning and completion stages as well as scope of works for each phase can be corrected by the Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point), UNDP Country Office based on reasonable justification by the consultant. SDC reserves the right, if necessary, to amend the terms of reference of a consultant on a written agreement. The final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of consultancy assignment. All deliverables should be submitted to UNDP by the Consultant in e-version in English and then approved by Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point), UNDP Country Office.

#	Deliverables	Timeframe	Payment
1	Report on inputs/support provided to and accepted by the International Consultant/Evaluator in development of draft MTR report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes developed, submitted and approved by Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point), UNDP Country Office	25 August 2020	40%
2	Report on inputs/support provided to and accepted by the International Consultant/Evaluator in finalization of the MTR with audit trail detailing developed, submitted and approved by Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point), UNDP Country Office	16 October 2020	30%
3	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	27 October 2020	30%

VI. Payment Conditions and Specifications

This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and other related costs, if any, required to produce the above deliverables. Payment will be released in 3 (three) instalments (40%, 30% and 30%) upon timely submission of respective deliverables (#1, #2, #3) and their acceptance by Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point) in Country Office, UNDP Uzbekistan.

VII. Recruitment Qualifications

Education:	A Master's degree in energy, including energy efficiency and renewable energy, energy economics and financing, natural resources sustainable management or other closely related field
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work experience in the relevant areas for at least 5 years; • Sound knowledge of green economy/energy financing and economics; • Experience applying RBM and SMART indicators for analysis/researches; • Sound knowledge of climate change mitigation related to development project/programs; • Experience working in the Central Asia region; • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation; • Previous experience working for international development organizations will be considered an asset.
Language Requirements:	Excellent English communication and writing skills, and fluent Russian and Uzbek is required

Others:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong organizational skills, ability to interact productively in a teamwork environment;• Timely delivery of good-quality products;• Excellent analytical, writing, presentation and communication skills, result and client oriented, capable of team working;• Ability to perform under tight deadlines and timely task
---------	---

	performance, ethics and honesty; • Ability to use information and communication technology as a tool and resource.
--	---

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.

VII. Signatures - Post Description Certification

Incumbent (*if applicable*)

Name **Mr. Saidmamatov Olimjon**

Signature



Date 15.10.2020

Resource Management Associate (M&E focal point), UNDP Country Office

Ms. Kamila Alimdjanova

Name / Title

Signature



Date 15-oct-2020

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF climate change mitigation focal area Tracking Tool (METT) at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the the UNDP-GEF full-sized project titled "Market Transformation for Sustainable Rural Housing in Uzbekistan" Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report⁹

- i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
3. Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*
 - 5.1 Conclusions

⁹ The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (METT)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

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

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹⁰**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: **Olimjon Saidmamatov**

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 Urgench, Uzbekistan on October, 2020

Signature:



¹⁰ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

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