



Annex 1 - Terms of Reference (ToR)

**International Consultant for the Post-Project Review
of the Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border
Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey Phase-I**

Location: Ankara and Iğdır (Duty Station)

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post level: International Consultant

Language required: English

Duration of the Contract: November 2017 – December 2017

1 Background and Context

Border management is regarded as being one of the most priority areas of EU Accession process for Turkey. After the membership to the EU, as Turkey's eastern borders will be the external borders of the Union, management of a comprehensive border security and its implementation constitutes an important subject. However, management of the eastern borders is not an easy task due to geographical and climate conditions of Turkey in that region. Moreover, this region constitutes a big problem in terms of being the illegal crossing route and in order to provide the border security in this region, landmines had been used mostly to prevent illegal border crossings, smugglings and resulting security challenges. For the time being these land mines constitute a very serious threat for border management in that region.

The landmines are generally located in border areas mainly in Armenian, Nakhcevan, Iranian, Iraq and Syrian Borders. This constitutes a very important problem in terms of providing an efficient border management system. These land mines are generally laid along the borders to prevent illegal movements or smuggling activities or for security challenges. Under the current circumstances, in addition to the humanitarian concerns, these landmines limit the operational capacity of Turkey in the border areas. They prevent the establishment of good functioning border surveillance systems and as a result lead to a decrease in the efficiency in the fight against illegal movements, cross-border crimes and smuggling. For these reasons, demining is evaluated as an indispensable part of the border management reforms. Turkey targets to have these landmines cleared to provide a more secure way of protecting the borders by means of technologically supported border surveillance systems and achieve the targets set out by European Union for a good functioning border management system.

Within this framework, having an ultimate objective of contributing to the social and economic development through demining and more secure borders in Eastern Turkey, the "Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey Phase I and II" was developed. In first phase of the Project, it has been planned to

United Nations Development Programme

clear the mined areas in the regions of Van-Ağrı-Kars-Iğdır and to introduce more modern border surveillance systems instead.

The Phase-I Project is composed of 3 components:

- Component A – Clearance: This component covers the mine clearance activities for the selected regions.
- Component B – Certification/Quality Control (QA/QC): This component covers the quality assurance, quality control and post-clearance certification to provide confidence (to the beneficiary and the implementation agency) that clearance and quality requirements defined in the standards have been met and that cleared land is indeed safe for use.
- Component C: Post-clearance: This component aims to identify the lessons-learned which are relevant to the planning, preparation and clearance phases of the operation through the conduct of a formal post project review (PPR).

The project is expected to generate the following results:

- Demining the border regions of Van-Ağrı- Iğdır-Kars is completed.
- Post project review is conducted.
- Demined areas are certified in compliance with the international standards.

The project main impact will be observed through the prevention of illegal migration and all types of cross-border crimes at Turkey's Eastern borders in line with EU's IBM policies and strategies via demining the area and providing effective and humanitarian border surveillance tools for a technologically supported modern border surveillance system.

The Ministry of National Defence (Turkish Mine Action Center (TURMAC)), Ministry of Interior (Border Management Department) and Turkish General Staff (Land Forces Command) are the main beneficiaries of the Project. UNDP provides technical assistance for the efficient and effective implementation of the Project through the Grant Contract, signed between CFCU (Central Finance and Contracts Unit) and UNDP and endorsed by the Delegation of the European Union to Turkey (EUD).

This Terms of Reference is for the International Consultant for the Post-Project Review of the Socioeconomic Development through Demining and Increasing the Border Surveillance Capacity at the Eastern Borders of Turkey Phase-I ('Project', hereinafter), who will provide technical assistance to the UNDP and TURMAC on preparation of post-project review under the overall guidance and supervision of the UNDP Project Manager.

2 Evaluation Objectives and Scope

The objective of the assignment is for the Consultant to provide technical assistance to the UNDP in identifying the lessons-learned which are relevant to the planning, preparation and clearance phases of the project through the conduct of a formal post project review (PPR).

In line with the evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, the below areas will form the parameters of the evaluation and the areas in which recommendations should be made for a subsequent approach.

Strategic Positioning, Concept and Design

The evaluation will assess the concept and design of the project, including an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the intervention in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of

United Nations Development Programme

management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated, particularly the evaluation is to assess the use of adaptive management.

Partnership and Coordination

The evaluation will assess effectiveness and appropriateness of the collaborations and partnerships that were established to deliver support to the project. This includes an assessment of the partnerships with key stakeholders, ministries, donors as well as with international partners. The evaluation should draw conclusions about the extent to which the UNDP were effective in coordination.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Management

A further focus of the evaluation will be on the extent to which adequate monitoring was undertaken throughout the period, and the extent to which evaluation systems were adequate to capture significant developments and inform responsive management. The evaluation will assess how Lessons Learned have been captured and operationalized throughout the project implementation.

Rights-based Approach and Gender Mainstreaming

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project sought to strengthen a rights-based approach and the mainstreaming of gender into development efforts. This should look at what measures were taken to this end and how successful those have been in addressing specific rights- and gender-related aspects of the mine action.

3. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation should address the following questions among others (to be finalized in scoping phase):

Relevance

- To what extent was the support to the project by the UNDP based on clearly identifiable development needs as outlined in the government's strategies, international obligations and others?
- During the evaluation period, what economic, social or political changes have taken place that affected the project? How do these relate to the relevance of the mine action in Turkey?
- What opportunities are there to better align the support to the changed context and the needs of the beneficiaries?

Effectiveness

- To what extent were the outputs and outcomes of the project, and the indicators used, successful in guiding the support to have maximum positive impact of the project? How might this be improved in future?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes? To what extent have UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
- To what extent are the intended beneficiaries satisfied with the results? How well have gender considerations been taken into account?

Efficiency

- How cost-effective and time-efficient was the implementation by the UNDP of project activities and outputs in the evaluation period? What measures were taken to ensure competitiveness?

United Nations Development Programme

- To what extent are the planned funding and timeframe sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes?
- How appropriate was the approach taken to organizing clearance activities in terms of competitiveness? How could this be improved?

Partnership and Coordination

- How appropriate and effective has the UNDP partnership strategy been? What factors contributed to this effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Sustainability

- To what extent will the benefits and outcomes continue after external donor funding ends?
- What can be done to maximise the likelihood of sustainable outcomes?
- To what extent has the Government of Turkey increased its ownership of the mine action during the period in question? What impact has this had on external support?

Monitoring & Evaluation and Risk Management

- To what extent did the results framework allow for relevant monitoring of progress and impact of interventions? How could this be improved, with particular reference to the findings regarding relevance?
- How accurate was the risk assessment undertaken? How effectively were the risks managed?
- How effective were the provisions for oversight of the activities?

4. Evaluation Methodology

The ultimate design of the PPR methodology will result from consultations between the IC, UNDP and key stakeholders.

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance** – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness** – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency** – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- **Results/impacts** – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by the project, including direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impacts, benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.
- **Sustainability** – the likely ability of the project to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

United Nations Development Programme

The Project will be rated against individual criterion of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based* on the following scale:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Unsatisfactory (U) The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for *sustainability criterion*, the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

Financial resources:

- a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- b. What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-political:

- a. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
- b. What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- c. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
- d. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?

Institutional framework and governance:

- a. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes are in place for sustenance of project benefits?
- b. While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.

On each of the dimensions of *sustainability* of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:

- Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

United Nations Development Programme

- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if the project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

The IC should develop detailed methodology and work plan for PPR. The evaluation tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

Data collection and Desk review:

- Interviews with representatives of beneficiaries, donors, contractors, UNDP project management and technical team, and any other stakeholders as deemed necessary.
- Review of data including but not limited to reports, work plans, financial reports, meeting minutes, relevant terms of references, communications materials, audit recommendations, consultant evaluations, and records of communications between stakeholders.

Field Visits:

- Visits to provinces where clearance activities conducted.
- Interviews and discussions with field-level clearance operation staff.

Data Analysis:

- Application of triangulation of both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis to the results of the above data-gathering exercises for data consistency and accuracy. Sample Evaluation Matrix would be:

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

- Presentation of initial analysis to stakeholders as a means of refinement and quality review through interim report and a workshop.

5. Duties and Responsibilities

The PPR will be carried out by the IC. He/She will receive the support of UNDP Country Office and project management team, and will be assisted by a facilitator assigned by UNDP (when needed). The following duties and responsibilities defined for the IC are indicative and subject to further detailing through specific service requests to be made by UNDP during the course of the contract duration.

United Nations Development Programme

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology and PPR outline;
- Debriefing with UNDP and key stakeholders, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the PPR report;
- Interviews with all stakeholders;
- Debriefing UNDP and key stakeholders;
- Development and submission of the first Draft PPR Report. The draft will be shared with the key project stakeholders for review and comment, and will serve as background document for the PPR Workshop;
- Conducting the PPR Workshop;
- Finalization and submission of the Final PPR Report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report.

6. Deliverables

The Assignment will include interim and final deliverables, which will be further defined in the specific service requests to be made by UNDP to the IC.

The products expected from the IC are as follows:

- Detailed methodology, work plan and outline of PPR;
- Interim report with findings;
- Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;
- Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other demining projects;
- Description of best practices, and an “action list” in a certain area of particular importance for the project.

The IC will be responsible to submit the following deliverables.

Estimated Date	Estimated Number of Days to be invested*	Milestone/Deliverables
13-15 November 2017	3	Desk review, development of methodology, drafting mission programme. Incorporating comments received from UNDP Country Office (if necessary).
16-18 November 2017	3	In-country field visits, interviews, preliminary mission findings, briefing(s), debriefings with project partners.
20-21 November 2017	2	Interviews with beneficiaries, government representatives and donors.
22-27 November 2017	5	Submission of Draft PPR Report

United Nations Development Programme

27-29 November 2017	2	Preparation for PPR Workshop
30 November 2017	1	PPR Workshop
1-4 December 2017	3	Finalization of the PPR Report in line with the comments received from the relevant stake holders regarding the Draft PPR Report discussed at the PPR Workshop.
Total Number of days	18	
* The number of days may change among different activities and deliverables but the total days to be invested is expected to be maximum 25 days for the content of this TOR. UNDP has the right to request from the Consultant additional number of days to be invested for additional activities, based on the needs of the project.		

7. Timing, Duration and Place of Work

The IC is expected to invest a maximum 25 days in total to provide the deliverables to be specified in service requests.

Estimated contract start date: 13 November 2017

Estimated contract completion date: 4 December 2017

Place of work for the assignment is Ankara and Iğdir. The Consultant will travel to Iğdir to evaluate demining activities.

8. Services and Facilities to be provided by UNDP

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office in Turkey. UNDP will assign a facilitator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, coordinate the background work regarding the PPR Workshop and provide translation (when necessary).