



I. Position Information

Title: (INTERNATIONAL POSITION) Evaluation Specialist to Conduct the Final Project Evaluation of the Local-level Response for Employment Generation and Integrated Territorial Development (InTerDev) project

Department/Unit: InTerDev Project / Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development - UNDP Kosovo

Reports to: Project Manager/Programme Team

Duty Station: Prishtina, Kosovo

Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): Kosovo

Duration of Assignment: November 2016 – January 2017 (14 w/ds)

Need for presence of IC consultant in office:

partial

intermittent (explain)

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

Provision of Support Services:

Office space: Yes - *partial*

Equipment (laptop etc): No

Secretarial/Logistical Services Yes - *responsible InTerDev team members*

If yes has been checked, indicate here who will be responsible for providing the support services:

Signature of the Budget Owner:

II. Background Information

The InTerDev is an Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC)-funded, three-year project which aims to create institutional and local capacities that will facilitate the transition from survival-based to business and market-oriented economic activities. By the end of the implementation, the project is expected to achieve three results: 1) The capacities of municipal staff in Dragash/Dragaz and ґtrpce/Shtërpçë, involved in the provision of services for economic development and integrated rural development, are advanced to the point where the participating municipalities can offer services in an efficient, effective, and self-sustained manner; 2) New jobs and income generation opportunities are created through an improved market positioning and productivity of local micro and small enterprises, including farmers; 3) Bottom-up approaches and local-level concentration for employment generation are operationalized at municipal level through Territorial Employment Pacts (TEPs).

The quality of life of people in Kosovo, in particular in the two target Municipalities of the InTerDev Project in the south of Kosovo is undermined by several factors, including the lack of

access to employment opportunities and sustainable livelihoods, poor public service delivery at the local level, and vulnerability to shocks (not only in relation to the household's income). The compounded result of these elements is that many individuals live in a situation of social exclusion and marginalization, which prevents them from participating as active citizens in the economic and social development of their communities.

Under the expected result 1, the project conducted a series of capacity development sessions for, and based on a consultative and participatory identification of needs by the municipality officials, private sector representatives, as well as civil society representatives in the target municipalities. The provision of trainings focused on practical sessions to ensure application of the information learnt. The Municipal Development Centre in Suharekë/Suva Reka has contributed to the coaching services with knowledge and advice on effective municipal structures in order to efficiently facilitate employment generation and upgrading of (micro) enterprises, particularly household-based operations in specific value chains that have competitive and sustainable potential, as well as existing SMEs.

Under the expected result 2, the project has worked in close cooperation with the Local Development Fund (LDF) in the Municipality of Suharekë/Suva Reka and implemented 3 rounds of a grant scheme targeting local micro and small enterprises, including farmers, to increase their productivity and competitiveness. 57 grants have been disbursed in the three rounds of the scheme.

The Territorial Employment Pact developed for each municipality, under the expected result 3, has enabled local-level public institutions, municipal structures, the private sector, and the civil society to join forces in reducing unemployment, serving the most vulnerable groups in the municipalities of Dragash/Dragaz and Štrpcë/Shtërpcë. In this regard, several interventions under the TEPs have been implemented between 2014 and 2016 including a number of advisory services, upgrading of rural micro-enterprises, vocational training of unemployed youth, subsidized employment, green jobs and establishment of social enterprises in each municipality.

In Q4 of 2015, a scheduled external mid-term evaluation of the project was carried out, assessing the progress of the project made towards expected results and providing recommendations for the way ahead in the second half of the project. A comprehensive mid-term evaluation report provided a concise assessment of the achieved results and recommendations for improvement of project efforts in the remaining implementation period of the project.

The January 2014 - January 2017 InTerDev project entered its final stage of implementation and an external final evaluation of the project activities will be conducted to assess the overall progress of the project towards the expected results, identify how were the mid-term evaluation recommendations addressed through the implementation of the project activities and provide lessons learned and recommendations for future interventions of similar nature. To this end, the project will hire an Evaluation Team composed of an international evaluation specialist and a local evaluation specialist, who will work jointly to achieve the expected results.

III. Objective of the Assignment

The overall objective of this assignment is to conduct a final evaluation of the project in terms of its relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, and elaborate on the lessons learned and recommendations for future interventions of similar nature. The consultant will work together with and lead the Local Specialist under direct supervision of the Project Manager, in close consultation with the Programme Team. The project team will provide administrative and logistical support as needed.

IV. Scope of Work and Final Evaluation Questions

In order to achieve the above objective, the main tasks of the International Specialist (as the leader of the Evaluation Team) is to:

- In close cooperation with the Local Specialist, conduct a comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents and UNDP evaluation policies and, based on this information, draft and submit an inception report with appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation, the evaluation matrix, as well as the work plan and any technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented below **(3 w/ds)**;
- Together with the Local Specialist, conduct on-site field visits, meetings, discussions, and interviews with relevant stakeholders and project beneficiaries in Kosovo. The Evaluation Team is expected to share the list of interviews to be conducted beforehand, and receive feedback and clearance from UNDP and the Austrian Development Agency (ADA). An initial briefing meeting with the UNDP team will be held in order to finalize the evaluation design **(4.5 w/ds)**;
- Jointly with the Local Specialist, hold a debriefing workshop at the end of the mission with main stakeholders to summarize initial findings and recommendations **(0.5 w/d)**;
- Supported by the Local Specialist, and based on the feedback received during the debriefing workshop, draft a final evaluation report containing the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP and its partners for future interventions of similar nature in the target areas and beyond. These recommendations should contain specifically to whom of each of the partners of the project they are addressed. The International Specialist is the lead writer of the evaluation report. **(4 w/ds)**;

The final evaluation report must 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, including a summary of the lessons learned and recommendations
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation methodology
- Data analysis

- Findings and conclusions
 - Lessons learned
 - Recommendations
 - Report annexes
- Finalize the final evaluation report, accounting for the UNDP and stakeholders feedback on the first draft (2 w/ds).

The following evaluation criteria and related evaluation questions are proposed for the evaluation process; however, these can be expanded and modified by the evaluator. Each evaluation criteria must be ranked as per UNDP ranking methodology.

Evaluation questions:

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions suggested
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the project's activities and any of their continuation still relevant for the main beneficiaries? ▪ Has the initiative tackled key challenges and problems? ▪ Were cross-cutting issues, principles and quality criteria (i.e. for private sector development¹) of the Austrian Development Cooperation duly considered/mainstreamed in the project implementation and how well is this reflected in the project reports? How could they have been better integrated? ▪ How did the project link and contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what level has the project reached the project purpose and the expected results as stated in the project document (logical framework matrix)? ▪ What challenges have been faced? What has been done to address the potential challenges/problems? What has been done to mitigate risks? ▪ In what ways did the project respond to the findings/recommendations of the mid-term evaluation in the second half of project's implementation?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the project ensuring sustainability of its results and impacts (i.e. strengthened capacities, continuity of use of knowledge, improved practices, etc.)? Did the project have a concrete and realistic exit strategy to ensure sustainability? ▪ Are there any jeopardizing aspects that have not been considered or abated by the project actions? In case of sustainability risks, were sufficient mitigation measures proposed? ▪ Has ownership of the actions and impact been transferred to the corresponding stakeholders? Do the stakeholders / beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the ownership of the actions and results of the project and maintain and further develop the results?
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there evidence of long lasting desired changes, in which aspects? ▪ How much did the project lead to a change of behaviours and motivations (of local governments) in terms of paying attention to marginalised and vulnerable population groups? Is there clear evidence for it? ▪ Has the project appropriately reached its target groups? Did the project serve the needs of vulnerable groups, i.e. women, youth, non-majority communities?

¹ Found at: http://www.entwicklung.at/uploads/media/IV_Quality_Criteria_on_Private_Sector_Development_01.pdf

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What effects were realized in terms of social inclusion? Did vulnerable groups had the same possibilities to participate and benefit, or was there a clear distinguishment? ▪ How did the project contributed to (more) sustainable management of natural resources? ▪ Is there evidence that institutional systems/mechanisms are in place which: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Supports further capacity development at local level; and 2) Promotes sustainable and inclusive development
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the resources been used efficiently? How well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? (in comparison to the plan) ▪ Was the overall aid coordination properly ensured in the field of local economic and rural development in the target area? ▪ Were the management and administrative arrangements sufficient to ensure efficient implementation of the project?
Stakeholders and Partnership Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How has the project implemented the commitments to promote local ownership, alignment, harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability?
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were intended results (outputs, outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?
Theory of Change or Results/Outcome Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Theory of Change or project logic feasible and was it realistic? Were assumptions, factors and risks sufficiently taken into consideration?
Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What effects were realized in terms of gender equality and women's empowerment? ▪ Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within project?

V. Methodology and Evaluation Ethics

The Evaluation Team may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods it deems appropriate to conduct the project final evaluation. Methods should include: desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; field visits; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. However, a combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The Evaluation Team is expected to revise the methodological approach in consultation with key stakeholders as necessary, particularly the intended users and those affected by final evaluation results. The Team should present its findings in both quantitative data and qualitative recommendations.

The Evaluation Team is expected to hold interviews and meetings with the relevant staff of UNDP, ADA, municipal officials, partners, and beneficiaries. The Team will be expected to share the list of interviews to be conducted with UNDP and ADA beforehand.

The suggested methodology should be compatible with the UNDP approach to evaluations as described in the [Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation](#).

Prior to the Evaluation Team's arrival, it will receive a list of documents to be consulted for its review. The Team will have latitude to design a detailed evaluation scope and methodology and will present a proposed work plan as part of the inception report to UNDP before arrival to Kosovo in order to optimize the time spent during the field mission.

The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). The Evaluation Team must address any critical issues in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

<i>VI. Expected Results</i>	<i>Tentative due dates (2015):</i>	<i>Approval by:</i>
Inception report containing appropriate methodology to be applied during the final evaluation, as well as the work plan and technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment is drafted, submitted, and endorsed by UNDP after consultation with ADA.	9 th of November 2016	Project Manager/Program me Team
Field visits, meetings and interviews in Kosovo are conducted, gathering data to be used in the final evaluation report.	1 st of December 2016	Project Manager/Program me Team
A debriefing workshop with key stakeholders is held and initial findings and recommendations presented.	2 nd of December 2016	Project Manager/Program me Team
Draft final Evaluation report with the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, a presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP and its partners for future interventions of similar nature is formulated, based on the findings acquired during the field mission to Kosovo and through the relevant project documentation, and submitted.	12 th of December 2016	Project Manager/Program me Team
A Final Evaluation report accounting for the UNDP, ADA, and stakeholders feedback on the first draft is produced and validated by UNDP.	20 th of January 2017	Project Manager/Program me Team

VII. Deliverables / Final Products Expected

1. Inception report containing appropriate methodology to be applied during the final evaluation, as well as the work plan and technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment is drafted, submitted, and endorsed by UNDP after consultations with the Austrian Development Agency.
2. Draft Final Evaluation report is submitted.
3. A Final version of the Final Evaluation report accounting for the UNDP, ADA, and stakeholders feedback on the first draft is produced and validated by UNDP.

VIII. Requirements and qualifications

Education:

- Master's degree in social sciences, economic development or other related qualification.

Experience:

- At least 5 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level is required.
- Experience with local economic and rural development is considered a distinct asset. Previous work experience in the Western Balkans, preferably Kosovo in particular, is considered an asset.
- Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of development interventions is required.

Language requirements:

- Fluent in English. Excellent analytical and report writing skills in clear and fluent English.

IX. Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Committed to highest regards of professionalism, impartiality, accountability, transparency, ethics, and integrity;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, ethnicity, and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Demonstrates substantial experience in gender equality and social inclusion.
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional Competencies:

- Ability to work effectively within a team and develop good relationships with counterparts and stakeholders;
- Ability to synthesise research and draw conclusion on the related subjects;
- Ability to pay attention to details;
- Demonstrates transparency and provides feedback to all those who will contribute to the evaluation;
- Excellent interpersonal skills and ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing;
- Ability to establish effective working relations in a multicultural team environment;
- Commitment to accomplish work;
- Responds positively to critical feedback;
- Results and task oriented.

X. Scope of price proposal and schedule of payments

Remuneration - Lump Sum Amount:

The Contract is based on lump sum remuneration and shall be processed subject to deliverables as per the schedule listed below:

- Upon signature of the contract: **20% of the total amount of the contract**
- Deliverable 2 . Draft Final Evaluation report: **50% of the total amount of the contract**
- Deliverable 3 . Final version of the Final Evaluation report: **30% of the total amount of the contract**

Required Presentation of Offer:

The following three documents must be submitted in order to be evaluated and

considered for the assignment:

- **P11 (signed)**, 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

(P11 can be downloaded at UNDP web site:

<http://www.ks.undp.org/content/kosovo/en/home/operations/jobs/>)

- **Technical proposal**, a max. 2-page document briefly outlining the methodology envisaged for the assignment for delivering the expected results within the indicated timeframe (an interview will be conducted for the shortlisted candidates);

- **Financial proposal**, The consultant is expected to provide an all-inclusive lump sum amount/financial proposal. The Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer:

Offers will be evaluated utilizing a combined Scoring method . where the qualifications, technical proposal, and the interview will be weighted a max. of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.

Acceptance by the IC holder:

Name and signature of the IC holder: