****

**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE**

Date: 31 October 2018

**Country:** Georgia

**Description of the assignment:** International Consultant to Conduct Mid-Term Evaluation of “Supporting Public Administration Reform (PAR) in Georgia” Project

**Project name:** “Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia” (PAR)

**Period of assignment/services:** Up to 20 working days within a 3 months period (January-March 2019) (maximum 7 days in mission with 1 trip)

**Deadline for submission:**

**1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT:**

In 2016 UNDP Georgia rolled out the multi-year project “Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia”, funded by the UK Government.  The project addresses a complementary, but distinct, set of specific, predetermined needs in three crucial areas of the ongoing Public Administration Reform (PAR) - Policy Development and Cooperation; Civil Service and Human Resource Management, and Service Delivery, as stipulated by the PAR Reform Roadmap 2020. The initiative intends to sustain, support, and build key institutions and processes required for advancing Public Administration Reform by offering consultancy, capacity building, technical assistance, etc.

The goal of this project is to enhance the capability of the Government of Georgia to implement its national development agenda through a more effective, professionally trained, unified, and independent public administration that delivers public services with greater accountability and responsiveness to citizens’ needs. The following outputs contribute to achieve the stated goal:

**Output 1 Policy Development and Coordination:** Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG) being ready to effectively manage (plan and implement) and guide (monitor and evaluate) PAR process

**Output 2 Civil Service and Human Resource Management:** Professional civil service established by strategically managed process, civil servants uniformly trained, and mechanisms established to protect them from arbitrary decisions.

**Output 3 Service delivery:** Quality services delivered based on innovative, consistent, and replicable methodology, as well as the analysis of usage data patterns and consumer feedback

More specifically:

**Output 1: Policy Development and Coordination**

Output 1 aims to develop the policy making process in the country, and enhance policy planning and coordination, by strengthening the capacity of the policy units of line Ministries and closely cooperating with the AoG so that the latter can effectively manage and guide the PAR process. Policy planning and Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms will be strengthened through the development and operation of a tool for government-wide, holistic tracking and monitoring of whole-of-government level programs.

**Output 2: Civil Service and HR Management**

Output 2 aims to support the development of an increasingly professional, uniformly trained civil service that is protected from arbitrary decisions. This will be achieved by: using interactive trainings to increase knowledge and awareness among civil servants about ongoing civil service reform and its implications; the implementation of a Change Management Plan developed based on a Change Management Readiness Assessment; the operationalization of a Unified Civil Servants Training System; the introduction of a staff performance appraisal system based on effective international models; the development of tools for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and engagement of civil society organizations to provide evidence and practical solutions to enhance policy planning, civil service reform and public service delivery.

**Output 3: Service Delivery**

Output 3 aims at: developing Common Standards and Principles of Public Service Delivery through commissioning a baseline study of the current service delivery practices, which will help identify and select the best-suited service delivery and quality assurance model that can be used for improving and streamlining service delivery in public service provider organizations in Georgia; establishing a Competence Centre on e-governance to serve as a key marketing, training and advisory institution to promote Georgian e-government best practices and e-government solutions in the country and abroad; integrating citizen feedback into the development of online services. Under the GoG e-governance strategy it is planned to further develop My.gov.ge as the meta-platform for offering all electronic services through the use of an electronic ID card. The activities will include expanding communication efforts that will help better integrate customer feedback and improve customer support by offering telephone/online help-lines, advancing quality of e-services, and progressively ensuring that all government services are also available online.

The PAR project was launched in 2016 and will be implemented through December 2020. Additional information on the project can be accessed at <http://www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/projects/supporting-public-administration-reform-in-georgia.html>

In the case of a positive assessment, the incumbent will be contracted to conduct final evaluation of the project, to be carried out at the end of the project, December 2020.

**2.** **Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives**

The overall purpose of the consultancy is to inform decision-making on the future implementation of the project through a methodologically sound, credible, impartial and independent assessment of the achievements and shortcomings of the project to date.

The specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation (or review) are:

* To review progress towards the project’s objectives and expected outcomes,
* To identify strengths and weaknesses in design and implementation,
* To identify risks and countermeasures,
* To assess the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and delivering its intended outputs,
* To assess the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the project in terms of achieved outputs and results and its contribution to Country Program Document (CPD) outcome,
* To identify lessons learned and good practices.
* To provide recommendations on modifications to increase the likelihood of success (if necessary).

In parallel to this consultancy assignment, Mid-term review will be conducted with the goal to collect, analyse, and provide information on the current status of Public Administration Reform in the areas of policy development and cooperation, civil service and human resource management, and service delivery. The consultant will be required to incorporate preliminary findings of this review into its final consultancy deliverables.

The scope of work for consultancy will include, but may not be limited to:

* Complete a desk review of all project-related documents including the project document, budgetary documents, reports, and internal evaluations.
* Elaborate an evaluation matrix with evaluation criteria, the related evaluation questions (and, where needed, sub-questions), the data sources required to answer the questions, the data collection and data analysis methods.
* Conduct meetings/interviews with current team members, along with the counterparts at Government of Georgia, donors and key partners, and the UNDP Country Office.
* Facilitate a workshop with PAR project team and key partners on project progress, planned activities, and the likelihood of achieving an impact.
* To collect quantitative data, including retrieving public information from government agencies (if needed), necessary for the evaluation.
* Document and analyse collected information in order to develop at least one case study per output (at least 3 case studies in total).
* Analyse data in accordance with the evaluation objectives per component, and in a broader context: against the Project's Objectives but also in a general development sense.
* Identify risks and counter‐measures, describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of the sustainability of project outputs.
* Identify a list of ’lessons learned’ and make recommendations for corrections.
* Recommend measures likely to lead to improvements, adjustments to the implementation approach, and alternatives as required in the context of an implementation framework.
* Assess whether the project has an appropriate strategy for knowledge transfer and describe the results of this strategy to date.
* Analyse the project’s contribution to UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
* Incorporate the findings of Evaluation of Civic Innovation and Research Grants, conducted separately within the PAR project.
* Incorporate preliminary findings of PAR Mid-term review, conducted externally by the research company.
* Prepare a Draft Evaluation Report providing descriptive overviews, laying out the facts, analysing UNDP’s contribution based on evaluation criteria and SDGs, outlining risks and lessons learned, and providing conclusions and recommendations.
* Finalize an Evaluation Report based on solicited feedback from UNDP team and key stakeholders.
* Present the documents at a national consultation and dissemination workshop.

**3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

The incumbent will be tasked to conduct the evaluation as per UNDP Evaluation Policy[[1]](#footnote-1), focusing on seven areas of evaluation (evaluation criteria): relevance, appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and gender.

**Relevance & Appropriateness:**

* To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
* To what extent does the project contribute to the Theory of Change for the relevant CPD outcome?
* To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design?
* To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

**Effectiveness:**

* To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
* To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
* To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

**Efficiency:**

* Is the relationship between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable? What is the cost-benefit ratio?
* To what extent have individual resources been used economically?
* Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?
* To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent has UNDP’s project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
* To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
* To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Sustainability:**

* Examine the political, organizational, human resource, and financial sustainability of the sub-project/consultancy. What threats to sustainability exist, and how has the risk of these threats been mitigated/anticipated?
* Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? How is the sustainability or permanence of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?
* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholder’s ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?

**Impact:**

* To what extent did the project contribute to the CPD outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
* What is the forecasted impact of the project?
* Did the interventions contribute to reaching higher levels of project outputs and outcome? What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected?

**Gender:**

* To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

**4. Methodology**

The consultant will work together with the project team in the preparation of a methodology to answer the key research questions outlined above, as well as any other pertinent questions that may arise to adequately assess the mid-term picture. The incumbent must take into account UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and relevant programmatic documents, which will be supplied to the consultant at the beginning of the assignment. The final methodology should be approved by UNDP.

The study will utilize two major forms of research: background and primary.

1. Background research:
   1. Document Review of all relevant project documentation: Project Document, Logical Framework, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, Theory of Change, Annual/Semi-Annual/Quarterly Reports and other relevant knowledge products.
2. Primary research – aimed at forming new knowledge by collecting information through:
   1. Key informant interviews (KIIs), semi-structured interviews, stakeholder consultations and other participatory methods;
   2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with different Government and non‐government institutions, donors and external stakeholders;
   3. Individual case studies through in‐depth discussions with various levels of stakeholders and engaged institutions;

**5. Deliverables**

* Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan
* At least three case studies (At least one case study per output)
* A draft of an Evaluation report with the following key chapters, but not limited to:

1. Executive Summary (Brief description of the project, Context and purpose of the evaluation, Main conclusion, recommendation, and lessons learnt, etc).
2. Introduction (Purpose of the evaluation, Key issues addressed, Methodology of the evaluation, Structure of the evaluation, etc).
3. The project and its development context (Project start and its duration, Problems that the project fixed to address, the immediate and development objectives of the project, Main stakeholders, Results expected, etc)
4. Evaluation findings (Assessment per evaluation criteria, analysis through gender lenses, achievement to SDGs, sustainability, etc)
5. Recommendations and Lessons Learned (Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success)

* Final Evaluation report and presentation for the dissemination workshop

**6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

The International Consultant will work in cooperation with local Consultant (to be hired locally by the project) on this assignment.

Required Qualifications and competencies for International Consultant envisage the following:

**Education:**

* At least Master’s degree in Public Administration, Public Policy, Political Science, Management or related Social Science fields (minimum requirement).

**Experience**

* At least 10 years of professional experience in Projects’ Monitoring and Evaluation, preferably in governance and advanced knowledge of the public administration reform framework (minimum requirement).
* At least 15 projects on conducting baseline, mid-term and final evaluations, out of which at least 3 is in international setting (minimum requirement).
* Solid understanding of contemporary thinking related to development practices and public administration reform programmes, notably in this region.
* Familiarity with the region (particularly Georgia), its overall governance features, development needs, and directions.
* Knowledge of evaluation methodologies.
* Experience of working in Georgia and/or knowledge of the region’s context is an asset.
* Experience with the UN organization is an asset.
* Fluency in written and spoken English.

**Language:**

* Excellent command of written and spoken English

**Corporate competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Understanding of the mandate and the role of UNDP would be an asset;
* Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

**Functional competencies:**

* Strong communication and analytical skills;
* Demonstrated skills in drafting reports;
* Ability to work under pressure with several tasks and various deadlines;
* Actively generates creative, practical approaches and solutions to overcome challenging situations;
* Excellent writing, presentation/public speaking skills;
* A pro-active approach to problem-solving;
* Computer literacy.

**Leadership and Self-Management skills:**

* Builds strong relationships with the working group and with the project partners; focuses on impact and results for the project partners and responds positively to feedback;
* Cooperates with the working group effectively and demonstrates strong conflict resolution skills;
* Consistently approaches work with energy, positivity and a constructive attitude;
* Demonstrates strong influencing and facilitation skills;
* Remains calm, in control and good humored under pressure;
* Demonstrates openness to change, new ideas, and ability to manage ambiguity;
* Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
* Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge and competencies;
* Is able to work independently and manage competing priorities.

**7. Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The Consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on it data. The Consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

**8. Implementation arrangements**

The International Consultant will work under the direct supervision of the Supporting Public Administration Reform (PAR) Project Manager.

The service provider will be directly responsible to, reporting to, seeking approval from, and obtaining certificate of acceptance of outputs from the above-mentioned persons. In addition, the respective PAR team will be responsible to share relevant documents, contact details and other necessary information with the service provider.

During the Mid-term evaluation, the service provider is expected to interact with/interview the implementing partners of the “Supporting Public Administration Reform Fund” project, including: Administration of the Government of Georgia (AoG), including the Policy Planning Unit (PPU), Civil Service Bureau (CSB); Ministry of Justice – LEPL Public Service Development Agency (PSDA), LEPL Data Exchange Agency (DEA) and other line ministries, public agencies, and civil society organizations, whose list and contact details will be provided to the service provider by the commencement of the contract.

**9. Time-frame for the evaluation process**

The consultancy is expected to be carried out in January-March, 2019. The timeline for specific deliverables is the following:

* Inception report including the evaluation matrix, evaluation methodology, and evaluation plan (Within 1 week)
* At least three case studies (At least one case study per output) (Within 2 months)
* A draft of an Evaluation report with the following key chapters, but not limited to (Within 1.5 months):

1. Executive Summary (Brief description of the project, Context and purpose of the evaluation, Main conclusion, recommendation, and lessons learnt, etc).
2. Introduction (Purpose of the evaluation, Key issues addressed, Methodology of the evaluation, Structure of the evaluation, etc).
3. The project and its development context (Project start and its duration, Problems that the project fixed to address, the immediate and development objectives of the project, Main stakeholders, Results expected, etc)
4. Evaluation findings (Assessment per evaluation criteria, analysis through gender lenses, achievement to SDGs, sustainability, etc)
5. Recommendations and Lessons Learned (Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success)

* Final Evaluation report and presentation for the dissemination workshop (Within 2 weeks after receiving the comments from UNDP)

**10. Application submission process and criteria for selection**

**Application Process:**

Interested candidates should submit applications including the following:

* Completed Personal History Form (P11) that can be downloaded from <http://www.me.undp.org/content/montenegro/en/home/operations/jobs.html> or Detailed Curriculum Vitae
* Motivation Letter

**Evaluation:**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the cumulative analysis method:

Offerors will be evaluated against combination of technical and financial criteria. Maximum obtainable score is 100, out of which the total score for technical criteria equals to 70 and for financial criteria – to 30.

More specifically, following criteria will be used for evaluating the offerors:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical** | ***MAX. POINT*** |
| Master’s degree in Public Administration, Public Policy, Political Science, Management or related Social Science fields  Master’s degree - 12 Points **(minimum requirement);**  PhD – additional 3 points | 15 |
| 10 years of professional experience in Projects’ Monitoring and Evaluation, preferably in governance and advanced knowledge of the public administration reform framework  10 years - 12 Points (**minimum requirement**);  More than 10 years – additional 3 points | 15 |
| 15 projects on conducting baseline, mid-term and final evaluations, out of which at least 3 is in international setting  15 projects - 11 Points (**minimum requirement**);  More than 15 projects – additional 4 points | 15 |
| Understanding of contemporary thinking related to development practices and public administration reform programmes, notably in this region, would be an asset | 5 |
| **Verbal Interview** | 20 |

Offerors that do not meet Minimum Qualification Criteria will be automatically rejected, while the rest will form up the long list. The offerors who obtain minimum 35 points as a result of the desk review will be invited for the interview.

Offerors who pass 70% threshold, i.e. obtain minimum 14 points, as a result of the interview will be requested the financial proposal.

**Financial Proposal**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the ToR.  In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount. Maximum 30 points will be assigned to the lowest price offer. All other price offers will be scored using the formula (inverse proportion):  Financial score X = 30\* the lowest price offer/suggested price offer. All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal as well.

1. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation_policy_EN_2016.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)