# CA-CRM Mid-Term Evaluation Terms of Reference

**Post Title:** International Consultant for Independent Evaluation (Programme Mid-term Evaluation)

**Project:** UNDP Central Asian Programme on Climate Risk Management (CA-CRM)

**Duty station:** Home-based with one mission in to Central Asia (visit to Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan - desk review and remote interviews)

**Duration of Assignment:** 01 May to 31 July 2013 (approx. 30 w/d)

**Type of Contract:** IC Contract

**Educational Background:** Advanced university degree in technical, economics or environment related issues.

**Work Experience:** At least 15 years extensive experience in climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, climate risk management or other relevant fields, experience with evaluations of UNDP Projects; Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven projects; Experienced in project cycle management.

**Background and context**

Central Asia (CA) is one of the world’s most vulnerable regions to current climate variability and to the impacts of future climate change. This is as a result of a combination of factors, including: i) the region’s inherent aridity; ii) existing environmental mismanagement (a remnant of the Soviet era); iii) an environmental degradation – a legacy of central planning in the region; iv) under-investment in housing and infrastructure[[1]](#footnote-2); v) existing developmental challenges; vi) biophysical stresses; vii) high frequency of disaster events; and viii) underlying low climate-related disaster risk reduction and adaptive capacity. Climate change is likely to manifest in CA as:

* 1. increasing temperatures;
  2. changing rainfall patterns;
  3. increasing aridity;
  4. an increasing frequency of extreme weather events (such as dust storms, heavy rainfall, haze, heat waves and heavy winds); and
  5. an increasing frequency and intensity of climate-related disasters (such as floods, droughts, mudslides, avalanches and landslides).

Trends over the last few decades indicate that these predicted changes are already being experienced in CA countries (see national components for more details), and current climate variability is already adversely impacting on development. Considering that both current and future variability and changes need to be addressed and adapted to, Climate Risk Management (CRM) is an appropriate response, as it includes both climate-related disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

As a result of the above, climate change is likely to have serious consequences for three key sectors in CA, namely: water, agriculture and energy. Current climate variability is already impacting on these sectors, particularly where unsustainable development practices are prevalent. The current and future impacts on these sectors will have considerable implications for cross-sectoral concerns, such as water security, food security, energy security and human health (detailed below) and are subsequently likely to jeopardise many hard-won development gains. The significance of these impacts is largely due to the critical interfaces that exist between key sectors (e.g. water and agriculture or water and energy) in CA. Furthermore, although the region is prone to earthquakes, the majority of disasters are triggered by hydro meteorological hazards, including drought, floods, extreme temperatures and rainfall-related landslides; all of which are likely to increase under a changing climate.Unless timely, coordinated and sustainable CRM measures are implemented, CA is likely to experience considerable economic loss, humanitarian stresses and environmental degradation as a result of climate-related disasters, climate variability and change.

During the past decades, climatic variability in CA has triggered *inter alia* crop failures, malaria epidemics, and shortages in water for hydropower and irrigation, with considerable consequences for food, health, energy and water security. Recurrent drought (2000-2001 and later in the decade) has, for example, already affected hydropower generation, water supply for irrigation and household use, rainfed cropland, and pasture productivity. A 2008 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) multi-country risk assessment indicated that electric power generation shortages in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan stalled industrial growth in both countries as well as deprived millions of people of access to heat and electricity in severe winter conditions, resulting in a humanitarian crisis. To avoid this situation from reoccurring, the Kyrgyzstan government has been working to prevent reservoir water reserves from dropping to “dead levels” before winter of 2009. The increasing frequency of these events is likely to reduce the availability of irrigation water for agriculture in the downstream Central Asian countries, such as Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. Furthermore, above-average warming and glacial melting associated with global warming are expected to elevate the level of existing climate-related risks and create new patterns of risk. The climate change-related problems likely to be experienced in each key sector are elaborated below.

The Central Asian Multi-Country Programme on Climate Risk Management (CA-CRM)directly contributes to Outcome 1 of the Regional Programme for Europe and CIS managed by the Regional Centre in Bratislava: "By 2013, national and sub-national levels in the region have improved capacity to support the transition to low-emission and climate-resilient economies". CA-CRM assists the five Central Asian countries to adjust their national development processes to address risks posed by current climate variability and future climate change. CA-CRM seeks to strengthen the climate-related disaster risk reduction and adaptive capacity, promote early action and provide the foundation for long-term investment to increase resilience to climate-related impacts across the region.

Ata national level, in each of the five countries, the Programme works to:

* strengthen institutional frameworks and technical capacity to manage climate change risks and opportunities in an integrated manner and develop climate-resilient strategies, policies and legislation in priority sectors and geographic areas;
* expand financing options to meet national climate risk management costs and implement climate risk mitigation interventions in priority areas; and
* disseminate knowledge on how to incorporate climate change knowledge and risks into development processes at national, sub-national and local levels.

At the regional Central Asian level, the Programme focuses on:

* strengthening technical capacity to manage climate-related risks and opportunities;
* sharing knowledge on adjusting national development processes to fully incorporate climate-related risks and opportunities; and
* synthesising and further developing knowledge on glacial melting in Central Asia (completed in 2011).

**Evaluation purpose**

The objectives of this evaluation is to (a) identify project design and management issues, (b) assess progress towards the achievement of the targets, the results and impact, and use of resources (c) identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP projects), and (d) make recommendations regarding specific actions and project adjustments that might be taken to improve the project, and support needed to achieve intended impacts at the end of the Programme. It 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.

This evaluation is initiated and managed by the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre, its Representative Office in Central Asia (Almaty, Kazakhstan), and the UNDP Country Offices in Central Asian countries. The Regional Programme Management Unit (Almaty, Kazakhstan), and the corresponding UNDP COs and CRM Projects' management units in the corresponding CA countries will provide assistance and support to the evaluator by providing logistical support including arranging for meetings/contacts with stakeholders including, local governments, other agencies, Civil Society Organizations, etc.

The evaluation should build on results of the following external evaluations implemented in 2012:

RBEC Regional  Programme Evaluation

The evaluation assessed the contributions made by the regional programme interventions during the current programme period 2011-2013 and UNDP’s strategic position within the region. A set of appropriate and forward-looking recommendations have been drawn at the end of the evaluation. It is expected that evaluation results will be used in the formulation of the next regional programme document. Results should also feed into other relevant evaluations planned by the Evaluation Office in 2012, such as the Global Programme Evaluation. CA-CRM has not been a specific focus of this evaluation.

Europe and CIS in the global programme evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation was to facilitate the UNDP Executive Board’s review of Global Programme IV and provide strategic inputs for the preparation of the Fifth Global Programme, as well as other, broader programmatic implications. The evaluation will provide UNDP management with findings and recommendations that are expected to assist in identifying strategies and operational approaches to further strengthen UNDP’s development effectiveness through its Global Programme. Similarly to the above, CA-CRM was evaluated as a part of the Global Programme.

BCPR Monitoring and Evaluation

A more in-depth review of the CA-CRM Programme was carried out within a monitoring mission from BCPR, which took place in Sept 2012. The mission looked at the implementation CA-CRM as a whole and its individual projects. The mission visited in person the Regional Project, National CRM Projects in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, and made a desk review and remote interviews of the national CRM Projects in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. The mission was undertaken by the Team Leader Results/PPD and the RBM/M&E specialist in the Results/PPD team. Draft report on this evaluation was provided in Dec 2012, which was a very brief and general document. Representative of CA-CRM commented on it and sent back to the evaluators. The final version of the report has not yet been provided.

Specific issues to be addressed by this evaluation should include but are not limited to:

1. Project design and its relevance in relation to:
   1. Development priorities at the regional and national level;
   2. Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;
   3. Country ownership/drivenness – participation and commitments of government, local authorities, public services, utilities, residents;
   4. Demonstrating increases in adaptive capacity or resilience of population in focus areas of interventions of projects under CA-CRM.
2. Performance - progress made by the CA-CRM projects relative to the achievement of its objective and outcomes:
3. Effectiveness - extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and the desired outcomes, and the overall contribution of the project to national strategic objectives;
4. Efficiency - assess efficiency against overall impact of the project for better projection of achievements and benefits resulting from project resources, including an assessment of the different implementation modalities and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of UNDP resources and actual co-financing for the achievement of project results; assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation;
5. Timeliness of results.
6. Management arrangements focused on project implementation:
   1. General implementation and management - evaluate the efficiency of Programme management (with respect to its size and composition, organizational structure, qualifications of the project team members, and the team performance), including the effectiveness of partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the perspective of “good practice model” that could be used for replication;
   2. Financial accountability – extent to which the sound financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems and adjustment of activities, budgets and inputs;
   3. Monitoring and evaluation at Programme level – assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation, and its internalisation by competent parties and service providers after the completion of the project; focusing to relevance of the performance indicators.
7. Overall success of the project with regard to the following criteria:
8. Impact - assessment of the results with reference to the objective of the project and the achievement of Programme goals and objectives, changes brought about by the project intervention, (benefits and change at the policy level that contributes to sustainability, impact in private/ public and/ or at individual levels);
9. Sustainability - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project;
10. Changes: Establish any changes that may have resulted from the project implementation at this point;
11. Stakeholder participation: Review the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism has been successful, its strengths and weaknesses. Particular attention should be paid to the level and type of participation by various stakeholders at different stages of the project implementation;
12. Contribution to capacity development - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions (municipalities) to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects’ results;
13. Replication – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region, outlining of possible funding sources; replication to date without direct intervention of the project; assess whether the project has potential to be replicated based on implementation progress so far, either in terms of expansion or replication either in country or in other countries and/or regions and whether any steps are being taken by the project to do so and the relevance and feasibility of such steps; assess whether there are specific good practices that can be replicated and what has made them successful;
14. Synergies with other similar projects, funded by the governments or other donors.

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory with the following guidance for the rating:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | CA-CRM Programme is expected to **achieve or exceedall** its outcomes, major goals and objectives, and yield substantial benefits in terms of strengthening resilience of economies and population in CA, without major shortcomings. The Programme can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | The Programme is expected to achieve **most** its outcomes, major goals and objectives, and yield substantial benefits in terms of strengthening resilience of economies and population in CA, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Marginally Satisfactory (MS) | The Programme is expected to achieve **most** of its outcomes, major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. The Programme is expected not to achieve **some** of its major goals and objectives. |
| Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU) | The Programme is expected to achieve **some** of its outcomes, major goals and objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major goals and objectives. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | The Programme is expected **not to achieve most** of its outcomes, major goals and objectives or to **yield any satisfactory** benefits. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The Programme has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its outcomes, major goals and objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

Issues of special consideration

The Evaluation Report will present the experience and recommendations for the benefit of design and implementation of other similar regional programmes and projects. Especially, the aspects of developing resilience to climate change at all levels will be looked into, including the ways of improving the modalities to reduce vulnerability of economies and population to the long-term changes and current climate variability.

Identification of climate change adaptation and hydro-meteorological disaster risk mitigation measures including economic and financial mechanisms of risk transfer will be learned, based on this evaluation. Capacity for adaptation, communication and awareness-raising to support climate change adaptation, integration of climate change risk considerations and adaptation into policy and planning processes, as well as the specific management practices for natural resources to support adaptation to climate change, shall be specifically assessed.

For future development support in the region, UNDP is especially interested in the assessment of the support model applied in the project, its implications for the long-term impact and sustainability of the project results.

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP and/or the Governments in CA, highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

**Evaluation methodolgy**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluator.

The evaluation methodology shall include information on documentation reviewed, interviews, field visits, and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the CA-CRM Project Documents (both regional and national components), project reports – incl. Annual Progress Reports (APRs), project budget revision, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Offices in CA countries, government counterparts in the countries. Guidance on individual stakeholders will be provided by managers and staff of the corresponding projects under CA-CRM. All relevant project documentation will be made available by the project management teams.

Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders will happen through circulation of initial reports for comments or other types of feedback mechanisms.

Throughout the period of the evaluation, the consultants will liaise closely with the senior management of UNDP COs in CA countries, Environmental Custer Managers in UNDP COs, UNDP Regional Technical Advisor in Bratislava, UNDP CA-CRM Regional Programme Coordinator, the concerned agencies of the Government and the counterpart staff assigned to the Programme. In addition, where appropriate, the consultant should liaise with the national interventions of UNDP on disaster risk reduction initiatives (i.e. DRMP Programmes/Projects). The consultants can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfil the task, the consultants however is not authorized to make any commitments to any party on behalf of UNDP or the Government.

**DeliverableS**

After about a week after signing the contract, the consultants is expected to provide a detailed assignment workplan with clear estimation of workdays spent on each activity, timing, and itinerary of missions. This deliverable will be the basis for the 1st instalment.

The output of the Mid-Term Review will be the Evaluation Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including the annexes).

Initial draft of the Evaluation Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and Regional Office) and the Programme Management. After incorporating the comments, the Evaluation Report will be finalised. If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

One mission to Central Asia combining regional and 2-3 national CRM Projects (including demonstrational sites) will be conducted.

**Timing and duration**

The mid-term review will be conducted within eight weeks (30 working days), starting from 1 May to 31 July 2013, according to the following activities and time frames:

Preparation (to be conducted within the first 2 weeks in home office):

* Familiarisation with the project through related documentation and information;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Develop work plan and discuss with UNDP for approval.

Mission to Central Asia (not more than 2 weeks, week 3-4):

* meeting with the CA-CRM Regional Programme Coordinator, international and national stakeholders in CA countries as per lists to be put together by managers of regional and national CRM Projects;
* visit to Programme's demonstrational sites in CA countries;
* present and discuss initial findings with UNDP, and the key national stakeholders;
* in order to save resources, distant media, e.g. online questionnaires, email, skype, etc., are to be utilised to the maximum extent

Elaboration of the draft report (within 3 weeks, weeks 5-7):

* Additional desk review;
* Completing of the draft report;
* Presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions;
* Additional information and further clarification with UNDP, Programme management and project staff.

Elaboration of the final report (within 1 week, week 8):

* Incorporation of comments and additional findings into the draft report;
* Finalisation of the report.

**Management, Logistics and Accountability**

The mid-term reviewer will work under the supervision of the UNDP Regional Technical Advisors from E&E and CPR Practices in Bratislava Regional Centre and CA-CRM Regional Programme Coordinatorin Almaty.

Although UNDP is administratively responsible for the conduction of the mid-term review, UNDP shall not interfere with analysis and reporting, except where requested and at opportunities for comments/feedback. UNDP will share the final version of the mid-term review report with the National stakeholder agencies.

#### PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The consultant fee will be as per UNDP norms and will be commensurate with qualifications and experience.

I on submission of a detailed assignment workplan – 20% of the total value of the contract;

II on submission of draft report – 50% of the total value of the contract;

1. on acceptance of final report – 30% of the total value of the contract.

**Competencies**

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism;
* Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment

**Functional Competencies:**

* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation, and Climate Risk Management;
* Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback

**Required qualification**

* Advanced university degree in technical, economics or environment related issues;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven projects;
* Experienced in project cycle management
* Recognized expertise in the field of natural resource management and vulnerability and adaptation studies (V&A), including Climate Risk Management, Climate Change Adaptation and/or Disaster Risk Reduction;
* Familiarity with issues of disaster risk reduction in Central Asia, Europe or Caucasus
* Work experience in relevant areas for at least 8 years;
* Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
* Advanced skills in analysis, reporting, facilitation of meetings, and team coordination
* Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Excellent English communication skills, working level of Russian language;
* Computer literacy.

The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance.

1. Infrastructure across CA is also breaking down as a result of limited maintenance since the break up of the Soviet Union. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)