TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Review within the GEF-UNDP-UNESCO project on Cryosphere

Responsible Unit: SC/ATA

Duration: 1 February 2025 – 30 June   2025

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled "Strengthening the resilience of Central Asian countries by enabling regional cooperation to assess glacio-nival systems to develop integrated methods for sustainable development and adaptation to climate change (PIMS # 5516) implemented through the UNESCO Almaty Regional Office, which is to be undertaken in 2025. The project started on the 22 October 2022 and is in its second year of implementation.

This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR.   The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Projects and the UNESCO Evaluation Policy
https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381664.locale=en
and the UNESCO Evaluation Manual:
https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383948.locale=en

The project was designed to strengthen the adaptation capacity of five Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) to climate change impacts on the cryosphere through assessment, promotion of regional cooperation, and stakeholder engagement. There is a need for long-term improvements in understanding of cryosphere dynamics, particularly those related to snow, glacier, and permafrost, in the Central Asian mountains and associated water availability in the downstream countries of Central Asia as problems associated with both quality and quantity of water become more acute and the potential negative impacts of accelerated glacier melt become a reality. The project was commenced on 15 October 2022 and is expected to conclude by 15 October 2026. It aims to strengthen the adaptation capacity of Central Asian countries to climate change impacts on the cryosphere through assessment, promotion of regional cooperation, and stakeholder engagement.

The primary stakeholders in this project include:

- National Government Agencies: Key ministries and agencies across Central Asia (e.g., Ministries of Ecology, Water Resources, Agriculture, and Environment Protection) are central to policy development and regulation in water and environmental management.

- Research Institutes and Universities: Regional and national research bodies (like the Central Asian Regional Glaciological Centre and others) contribute scientific expertise and data for sustainable solutions.
- Civil Society Organizations and Local Communities: CSOs, community groups, and women's organizations play a critical role in local implementation, outreach, and advocacy for gender-responsive, community-centered approaches.

Together, these stakeholders offer a broad spectrum of policy guidance, technical support, and local engagement, creating a comprehensive, collaborative approach to advancing sustainable environmental and water management initiatives in Central Asia.

There is a need for long-term improvements in understanding of cryosphere dynamics, particularly those related to the snow, glacier, and permafrost, in the Central Asian mountains and associated water availability in the downstream countries of Central Asia as problems associated with both quality and quantity of water become more acute and the potential negative impacts of accelerated glacier melt become a reality. Melting glaciers will also have widespread consequences for high mountain and lowland ecosystems of global relevance for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Knowledge systems need to be developed for assessing past, current, and future changes in the upstream–downstream interconnection trajectory and for developing governance and response options in the member states. To manage this issue, there is a need to address the issue of regional cooperation in building knowledge base and capacity on monitoring of snow glacier and permafrost including forecasting responses to climate change.

The project is designed to build this capacity through activities that support science-based consensus among the countries to develop and monitoring and assessment of cryosphere and to enhance understanding of climate change impacts on the cryosphere in Central Asia. The project will also support national as well as regional Strategic Action Programme (SAP), including implementation and demonstration projects that support climate change adaptation in the affected regions. Finally, the project will develop consensus on assessment and monitoring program for the cryosphere in Central Asia and will raise awareness among stakeholders and develop a knowledge platform.
The project strategy consists of two main elements:

1) Understanding potential impacts related to the cryosphere in Central Asia; and
2) Addressing these impacts by providing stakeholders with the necessary information, policy tools, skills, and proven approaches to adaptation.

The project fills a gap in present approach to assessment monitoring and management of resources in the region's cryospheric systems by launching a full-fledged initiative to strengthen management capacities and enhance multi-country cooperation to increase opportunities for sustainable development in a region that is highly susceptible to impacts of climate variability and change.

The project consists of six components:

1) Consolidating common knowledge in an integrated cryosphere information database in Central Asian countries.
2) Building the foundation for regional cooperation on the cryosphere in Central Asian countries.
3) Strengthening the capacity in Central Asian countries to monitor the cryosphere.

4) Demonstrating technologies and best practices for integrated water resources management and adaptation to climate change in glacier snow-fed river basins.
5) Increasing awareness and involvement of key stakeholders; and
6) Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and project learning.

The project is comprised of the following nine outcomes:

1. Science-based consensus among the countries on major challenges from melting glacier snow and permafrost and consequent water availability in the upstream-downstream in Central Asian region.
2. Stakeholders of the project have enhanced knowledge and understanding of changes in the cryosphere and permafrost and the expected implications of climate change for the region.
3. Countries have national action plans and a regional strategic action programme (SAP).
4. National and regional project stakeholder institutions are in place to implement national action plans and the SAP.
5. Countries use a standard approach to monitor the cryosphere in Central Asia.
6. Countries have increased capacity to undertake monitoring and apply skills in integrated water resources management (IWRM) and resilience to cope with cryosphere hazards.
7. Countries utilize innovative technologies and best practices for integrated resource management in the cryospheric systems.
8. Decision-makers and the public at the national, regional, and global level are increasingly aware of the economic and social costs of retreating high-altitude glaciers.
9. Project management and learning is informed by M&E.

A.   MTR Purpose

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 to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results, as well as underlying causes and lessons learned. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability. The primary users of the MTR will be the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub as implementing agency, UNESCO Almaty Regional Office as executing agency and the Project Management team   as a team designated to execute the project from UNESCO Almaty Regional Office standpoint.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In the framework of the GEF-UNDP-UNESCO project on "Strengthening the resilience of Central Asian countries by enabling regional cooperation to assess glacio-nival systems to develop integrated methods for sustainable development and adaptation to climate change", under the overall authority of the Director of the UNESCO Almaty Office and the direct supervision and guidance of the Project Manager (PM), a MTR is being commissioned for the project. An Evaluation Reference Group will steer the evaluation process and provide quality assurance that will be composed of the Project Team from the UNESCO Almaty Office, the UNDP Regional Office in Istanbul, Project partners, such as University of Fribourg, Research Institutes and Universities: Regional and national research bodies (like the Central Asian Regional Glaciological and others.

.
B. 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.

1. **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 within in all five components of the project. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
   - Review how the project addresses priorities of each country covered by the project. Review countries' ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the countries (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)? How well does the project address the needs of the countries involved?
   - Review how coherent is the project with other partners' initiatives operating in the same context?
   - 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, considered during project design processes? What are the project's most significant results, both outputs and outcomes? In what ways did UNESCO contribute to the achievement of these outcomes?
   - Review whether the project being implemented efficiently. To what extent did the management structure and allocation of financial and human resources support efficient implementation?
   - 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.
   - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
   - Review if the project is following the workplan within the planned timeframe.
   - Review if there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for.

   Results Framework/Theories of Change:
   - Undertake a critical analysis of the project's Results Framework 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 time frame?
   - 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.
   - Insure 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.

2. **Progress Towards Results**

- Review the results framework indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators 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.

3. **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.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to insure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to insure gender balance in the Project Board?

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 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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, 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?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.

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?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  o The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  o The identified types of risks[1] (in the SESP).
  o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).

---

[1] Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

<u>Reporting</u>
- 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.

<u>Communications & Knowledge Management</u>
- 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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

4. **Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the Quantum Risk Register 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:

<u>Financial risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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)?

<u>Socio-economic risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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 in the MTR report for evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. 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. 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 *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

C. MTR Approach & Methodology

The MTR report 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 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)), the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, 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 Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[2] insuring close engagement with the Project Team, the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of project stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[3] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

---

[2] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[3] 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.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned Evaluation Reference Group regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and insure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, the visits to Almaty UNESCO Regional Office where the project Manager and the Almaty project team are located, field visits as/if necessary and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed with UNESCO Almaty Regional Office, the Evaluation Reference Group and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must 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

D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall insure the preparation and submission of the following:

- <u>MTR Inception Report:</u> MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (10 February 2025)
- <u>Presentation</u>: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (25 March 2025)
- <u>Draft MTR Report</u>: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: (31 March 2025)
- <u>Final Report</u>*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving comments from UNESCO Almaty Regional Office on draft. Completion date: (30 April 2025)

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

E. Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNESCO Almaty Regional Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract. 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.

F. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR shall not exceed five months from when the MTR team is hired.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

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 region/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.

G. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

Competencies

The MTR team shall have prior experience in evaluating one or more technical assistance projects, either working for UNDP and/or other international organizations or in the private sector. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. Experience with evaluation/audit in the private sector or outside of the UN system is also an advantage. The MTR team selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project-related activities in Central Asia. The MTR team must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore, applications will not be considered from those who has had any direct or indirect involvement in the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to whom is associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project.

Education
- A master's degree in Public Administration, Environmental Science or Environmental Management and Policy, International Relations, International Studies or Diplomacy, International Development, Business Administration with a focus on Sustainability or Project Management, Climate Change and Sustainable Development, Project Management or other related field.

Required Experience
- Thorough understanding and at least 5 years' experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies.
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years, such as work experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in energy efficiency in transition economies.
- Proven experience in preparation of written reports in an accurate and concise manner in English.
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to international waters.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and international waters, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent interpersonal and intercultural communication skills.
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

Desired Experience
- Experience in working with the UNDP or another GEF agency on GEF project evaluations, Project evaluation/review experiences with GEF-funded projects will be considered an asset).
- At least 5 years of experience leading project evaluations in the fields of environment, climate change, renewable energy, or other relevant areas.

- Experience in evaluating projects, especially with International Waters projects is desirable.
- Experience in working with international technical assistance projects in the Europe and Central Asia region with international organizations is desirable.
- Experience working in Central Asia is desired.

Language
- Fluency in written and spoken English. Knowledge of Russian is an advantage.

H. Ethics

Each member of the MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to insure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also insure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to insure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

I. Schedule of Payments

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%
  - The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
  - The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
  - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

REMARKS

It is agreed that:

- Any possible bank charges of the recipient's bank and any charges of converting the amount shall be charged to the contractual amount.
- All payments related to this contract will be done based on the official UN Operational Rate of Exchange in force on the date of the payment.
- All expenses exceeding the total amount of the contract are under the responsibility of the Contractor.
- The UNESCO Almaty reserves the right to request the Contractor to provide information on the status of the work to insure proper and timely execution of the above work assignment.
- The Contractor should provide/submit all requested information/documentation that UNESCO may consider necessary for monitoring the progress of the work.
- UNESCO shall be credited in all possible publicity related to this contract through publications, website and other information supports.

Note to the applicants:

Please send the following documents to apply:

- An up-to-date curriculum vitae.
- A statement indicating how the candidate's qualifications and experience make him/her suitable for the assignment.
- An indication of the approach the candidate would adopt to carry out the assignment, including any inputs that may be required from UNESCO.
- The overall cost of the assignment should be expressed as an overall lump-sum.

The proposals and any supporting documents should be in English. The proposals should be submitted by e-mail not later than 26 December 2024 a.kulzhabayeva@unesco.org.

Should you be interested in this work assignment, please send us your written proposals by indicated deadline. We would be also grateful for further sharing of this call with other suitable candidates through your professional networks.