



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## I. Position Information

**Title:** *International Consultant – Final Evaluation of the Capacity Development Support for Public Institutions and Modernization of Public Administration Projects*

**Department/Unit:** Governance and Peace-building

**Reports to:** Marta K. Gazideda, Governance and Rule of Law Coordinator/Deputy Programme Coordinator

**Duty Station:** Pristina & Homebased

**Expected Places of Travel (if applicable):** N/A

**Duration of Assignment:** 1 March – 31 May 2017

### Need for presence of IC consultant in office:

partial (explain)

intermittent (explain)

full time/office based (needs justification from the Requesting Unit)

### Provision of Support Services:

Office space:  Yes  No

Equipment (laptop etc):  Yes  No

Secretarial Services  Yes  No

**Signature of the Budget Owner:** Marka K. Gazideda

## II. Background Information

The Public Administration Reform in Kosovo is a continuous process which includes changes to the legal and organization structure of central and local administration, personnel management, capacity development, results based management, as well as regulatory reforms. The *Capacity Development Support for Public Institutions (CDF)* Project was established in 2004 by UNDP and Kosovo Foundation for Open Society (KFOS), in cooperation with the Office of the Prime Minister, to assist with the implementation of the 'Standards for Kosovo' plan, and to provide advisory and coaching assistance to senior and middle level civil servants for public administration reform and European integration process.

In 2012, Kosovo gained a new momentum towards the European Integration, starting of the visa dialogue between Kosovo and the EU, and the conduct of a feasibility study for a Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) with Kosovo. These developments herald a unique opportunity for advancing the reforms and democratic development in the country.

Within this context, the overall objective of the CDF during 2013-2017 is to improve capacities of Kosovo institutions in policy planning, implementation, and administration, for effective and gender-responsive governance in the context of EU integration and Public Administration Reform.

The approval of the new Strategy on Modernization of Public Administration 2015-2020 and Action Plan 2015-2017 aims to foster a professional, transparent and accountable public administration in Kosovo, able to meet the demands of the citizens. To further support the implementation of the specific objectives the Strategy, and according to the priorities set forth in the Action Plan 2015-2017, a joint project was initiated by UNDP and the Ministry of Public Administration (MPA).

A final evaluation of both projects, CDF and Modernization of Public Administration, aims to identify and address the relevance, efficiency, non-contentiousness and appropriateness of delivered activities. Lessons

learned and the experience gained throughout the implementation of both projects will be disseminated and shared as widely as possible with the donor community and other relevant stakeholders, aiming to further improve the civil service processes.

The evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant who shall cover the following areas, not limited to: (i) European Integration; (ii) Public Administration; and (iii) Capacity development. The International Consultant to be contracted for this evaluation will be independent and shall not be involved in any way with these two UNDP projects. The Consultant will be responsible for the design of the methodology for the evaluation (including the draft report), for coordinating the work of the team and for consolidation of the draft and final reports.

### III. Objectives of Assignment

This final evaluation of both projects is being conducted to provide conclusions and recommendations about the relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the projects. The evaluation should enable UNDP Kosovo, the donor and other stakeholders to draw lessons from the integrated implementation approach for future similar undertakings and to assess what are the next steps that may need to be taken to ensure the sustainability of the actions undertaken and by whom.

Specific objectives are:

- Review all relevant reports, proposals and literature of the projects;
- Design a study to evaluate outcomes of the projects as stated above;
- Identify and conduct interviews with a sample of stakeholders in projects area to gather data on projects' results and outcomes;
- Evaluate the relevance of the projects for the main beneficiaries;
- Evaluate the efficiency of the projects and assess the appropriateness of the integrated approach of the projects;
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the projects;
- Identify factors directly influencing the level of achievement of the desired results;
- Evaluate the impact of the projects;
- Identify areas in which the implementation mechanism could have been improved, or not;
- Identify factors contributing to the effectiveness of the actions implemented;
- Evaluate the sustainability of the projects;

In case of identified barriers for achieving the desired results or identified needs for improvement, the evaluation should provide UNDP Kosovo with the prioritized list of recommendations for actions, with respective approach on addressing the identified issues.

### IV. Scope of work

Under the direct oversight of UNDP Governance and Peacebuilding Portfolio Manager/Deputy Programme Coordinator, and in close cooperation with beneficiaries; the consultant will advise, guide, support, and inform the following processes:

#### 1) Desk review phase

- Comprehensive desk review of various sources, relevant publications, research papers, etc.;
- Study the documents as a preparation for this assignment (work plans, midterm progress reports, annual progress reports, media coverage files, list of other documents that can provide background information is provided under Annexes);
- Inception report with brief description of the Methodology, Evaluation Matrix and the tentative list of interviews with stakeholders/beneficiaries;

#### 2) Field visit

- Undertake field work with key national and international interlocutors and stakeholders, and UNDP, (the tentative list of stakeholders/beneficiaries with contact details will be finalised and completed

by UNDP);

- Site visits to the project locations to conduct interviews (of both individuals and groups) to develop further intelligence on project operations, management, decision-making and implementation arrangements and to identify the relevance of the project.

### 3) Draft report

A draft report submitted based on desk research, questionnaire results, and field visits (including both projects).

### 4) Final report

A final report drafted based on desk review, survey results, and field visits. The evaluation report should be logically organized, clearly written, and understandable to the intended audience. The final report shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined below:

- Title and opening pages
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and methods
- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Report annexes

The following evaluation criteria and related evaluation questions are proposed for the evaluation process of both projects; however, these can be expanded and modified by the evaluators:

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions suggested
Relevance	-Is the project relevant for the main beneficiary? -Has the project tackled key European Integration and Public Administration issues? -How relevant was the project for the stakeholders?
Effectiveness	To what level the project has reached the results stated in the project document?
Sustainability	- Will the project results last in time? - Has the project approach incorporated transparency and accountability by the beneficiaries? - Has the project responded to the needs and priorities which were identified by stakeholders? - Have the capacities of the beneficiaries increased to take over the results of the Project, maintain and further develop the results? - Which measures have proved to be more effective to ensure sustainability?
Impact	- Is there evidence of long lasting desired changes? -Has the project influenced policy making at different levels? - Has the project impacted the desired target actors and how? - To what degree the project contributed to the development taken place in regards To the project goals? - Is there evidence that institutional systems/mechanisms are in place which: 1) supports further capacity for European Integration, Public Administration Reform and Capacity Developing; 2) implements the strategy and action plans; 3) promotes sustainable policies and programs and enhance public awareness in European Integration and Public Administration Reform;
Efficiency	- Have resources been used efficiently? - Have efforts for integrated approach been made appropriately?
Stakeholders and	-Who are the major actors and partners involved in the project and what were their

Partnership Strategy	roles and interests? -Was the partnership strategy effective?	
Evaluability	- Can the project be evaluated credibly? -Were intended results (outputs, outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable? -Were the monitoring systems in place?	
Theory of Change or Results/Outcome Map	-What are the underlying rationales and assumptions or theories that define the relationships or chain of results that lead project strategies to intended outcomes? - What are the assumptions, factors or risks inherent in the design that may influence whether the project succeeds or fails?	
Gender	- What effects were realized in terms of gender equality, if any? - Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within the project?	
<p>The response to the above questions should be followed by specific short and long term recommendations that could be undertaken by UNDP or the stakeholders.</p> <p>These analyses have to be done for each output and for the overall goal of the project (including both projects).</p> <p>The evaluation criteria must be ranked as per UNDP ranking methodology (1-6).</p> <p>External consultant is responsible for refining the evaluation methodology, evaluation questions, carrying out the evaluation and delivering UNDP Kosovo with a draft report and a final report. The evaluation process shall involve the key stakeholders during the project implementation cycle.</p>		

V. Expected Results			
Deliverables/ Outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required (Indicate title of the designated person who will review output and confirm acceptance)
<b>Desk review phase</b> – including inception report with brief description of the methodology, evaluation matrix, and tentative list of interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries;	1 March 2017	17 March 2017	Governance and Pace-building Portfolio Manager/Deputy Programme Coordinator
<b>Report on Field visit</b> – interviews/meetings, etc.	20 March 2017	31 March 2017	Governance and Pace-building Portfolio Manager/Deputy Programme Coordinator
<b>Draft report</b> – a draft report submitted based on desk research, questionnaire results, and field visits (including both projects);	3 April 2017	14 April 2017	Governance and Pace-building Portfolio Manager/Deputy Programme Coordinator
UNDP comments/ recommendations on draft report	17 April 2017	21 April 2017	Governance and Pace-building Portfolio Manager/Deputy Programme Coordinator

<b>Final report</b> - the final report is produced after a review of the first draft and incorporation of comments/recommendations of UNDP; provide the complete content of the report as per the main outline proposed under section 4 item d. Reporting	21 April 2017	15 May 2017	Governance and Peace-building Portfolio Manager/Deputy Programme Coordinator

<b>VI. Deliverables / Final Products Expected</b>
Report on field visits, including interviews meetings; Draft Report __ Evaluation of the Capacity Development Support for Public Institutions and Modernization of Public Administration Projects; Final Report__ Evaluation of the Capacity Development Support for Public Institutions and Modernization of Public Administration Projects;

<b>VII. Requirements qualifications</b>
---

Education:	Master Degree in Public Administration, Political Science, Public Policy, or related field. PhD will be an asset.	
Experience:	-A minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience with a proven track record; -A minimum of 8 years of working experience in enacting client-oriented reforms and providing strategic advice; -Knowledge of the aquis and experience in legal harmonization; -Specialized knowledge on public administration (central and municipal) legislation; -Specialized knowledge on European Integration; -Substantial experience at a senior level management/leadership in public organisation/institutions is a district advantage; -Familiar with Kosovo's public administration, particularly the reform process; -Highly developed coordination and facilitation skills and the ability to negotiate complex agenda with a broad range of stakeholders; -Experience of work in countries of the region would be an asset;	governir
Language Requirements	Fluency in written and spoken English; Albanian and Serbian languages would be an asset;	

<b>VIII. Competencies</b>
---------------------------

<p>Core Competencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrating/safeguarding ethics and integrity;</li> <li>• Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;</li> <li>• Demonstrate corporate knowledge and sound judgment;</li> <li>• Ability to provide strategic level advice and prepare policy documents;</li> <li>• Demonstrates experience in gender equality;</li> <li>• Treats all people fairly without favouritism;</li> <li>• Excellent analytical and organizational skills;</li> <li>• Creating synergies through self-control;</li> <li>• Managing conflict;</li> <li>• Informed and transparent decision making;</li> </ul>
--

Functional Competencies:

- Excellent ability to write reports, prepare and deliver presentations, provide training, plan and coordinate activities;
- Skills concerned with capacity development (especially with legislative drafting) and training on different levels of government;
- Excellent written communication skills, with analytic capacity and ability to synthesize project outputs and relevant findings for the preparation of quality project reports;
- Demonstrates transparency and provides feedback to all those who will contribute to the evaluation.

IX. Scope of price proposal and schedule of payments

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability;**
- **P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment;
- **Methodology** on how they will approach and complete the assignment;
- **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price (inclusive professional fee, living allowances, and travel), supported by a breakdown of costs.

Payment is made upon confirmation of deliverables by the Deputy Programme Coordinator UNDP Kosovo: 20% by the delivery of the inception report; 60% by the delivery draft report; 20% by the delivery of the final report.

**Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.

**Cumulative analysis**

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

\* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

*Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.*