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# Individual Contract

# Terms of References

## Identification of the Position

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Job Title: | International Evaluation Consultant for the Programme Evaluation  |
| Project: | Regional Programme on Local Democracy in the Western Balkans (ReLOaD)  |
| Supervisor: | Rural and Regional Development Sector Leader  |
| Location: | Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo[[1]](#footnote-2)\*, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia  |
| Travel requirement: | Yes |
| Practice Area: | Governance and Peacebuilding |
| Application deadline: | 7/15/2019 |
| Type of Contract: | International |
| Duration: | August - November 2019 (up to 47 expert days, ca. 27 days in the field)  |
| Presence in the UNDP premises | Partial presence  |

## Background and context

As a critical component of any democratic system, civil society has been and will continue to be an important actor of reform processes taking place in the Western Balkans (WB). In this context, the EU accession agenda in the region promotes the role of civil society in further democratisation, including consultation in decision making, contribution to processes associated with policy and regulatory changes, as well as performing a watchdog function and promoting public accountability. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia (hereinafter: EU IPA beneficiaries) face comparable challenges when it comes to the cooperation between governments and civil society organisations (CSO), including limitations in the overall environment for CSO operations, lack of structured CSO participation in public affairs and inadequate CSO capacities. While considerable public funding is allocated to CSOs, available procedures are often not transparent, monitoring of awarded funds is not performed and effects are not measured.

**In Albania,** the civil society sector remains fragmented, sporadically involved in decision making and overly dependent on donor funding. Comprehensive information on public funding of CSOs is not available. The State Agency for Support of Civil Society and some larger municipalities provide funding to CSOs based on competitive calls for proposals, but the lack of clear rules and procedures for public funding remains a major impediment to the sustainability of the CSO work. The Government adopted an updated roadmap meant to improve the overall environment for CSO operations, including in the area of CSO financing. Local governments report to have limited experience with CSO projects, mainly due to limited financial resources and lack of clear procedures.

**Bosnia and Herzegovina** experienced some progress in establishing institutional mechanisms for cooperation between governments and CSOs, as well as for public funding of CSOs. However, a strategic framework for cooperation with civil society is missing, while transparent procedures are needed for allocating public funding to CSOs across government levels. In general, CSOs have difficulties to mobilise financial resources, and only a fraction of them have a wide base support. Reporting by CSOs on received funding is inadequate, while governments rarely monitor CSO activities that they fund. Steps forward have been made through the EU-funded Reinforcement of Local Democracy (LOD) Project,[[2]](#footnote-3) which introduced transparent procedures for competitive project-based funding of CSOs by local governments.

Recent years saw improvements in government-civil society relations in **Kosovo**. Some progress has been noted in the overall environment for CSO operations and public consultations in policy making; however, CSO financing remains one of the major challenges. In 2017, the Government adopted a regulation stipulating criteria and procedures for public funding of CSOs, paving the way for improved governance and a more transparent use of public funds. However, capacities of CSOs and public authorities (local governments in particular) need to be improved to provide for abiding by the new standards of transparency and accountability. With the upcoming 2019-2023 Strategy for Cooperation between Government and Civil Society, the Government demonstrates commitment to further enhance the environment for CSO work.

The climate in which CSOs operate in **the Republic of North Macedonia** has somewhat improved, with the Government showing commitment to dialogue and inclusion. The 2018-2020 Strategy for Collaboration with Civil Society, among others, envisages further support for civil sector development, civil society participation in policy design and implementation, and improved CSO sustainability, including through transparent public funding. The Government formed a special unit that administers the CSO funding through public calls in accordance with the relevant legal provisions. Generally, public funding for CSOs is limited and has been declining over time. Cooperation between local governments and CSOs remains weak and there is no unified system for CSO funding with clearly defined rules and procedures.

**In Montenegro**, mechanisms for government’s consultation of CSOs are in place, but they need clear rules, and genuine engagement on both sides. In 2017, the Government adopted a strategic framework to enhance the environment for CSO work and amended the relevant legislation introducing a new system for funding of CSOs from the state budget. All local governments have adequate decisions on criteria for allocation of funds to CSOs, envisaging public calls for proposals. However, majority of local governments face challenges with the implementation of those decisions, including programming of funds for CSOs, defining of priorities for financing in consultation with CSOs, monitoring and reporting on allocated funds. Moreover, CSO capacities to design and implement projects to the benefit of their target groups remain limited.

**Serbia** introduced a regulatory framework that provides for the participation of CSO in public policy making at both national and local level, as well as for financing CSO from public sources, including local government budgets. However, further efforts are needed to strengthen cooperation between the government and civil society and enhance the environment for CSO operations. CSO work continues to be challenged by the lack of stable funding. Also, to ensure overall transparency, criteria for financial support need to be better defined (at the local level in particular) and robust monitoring and evaluation practices need to be introduced. With several training sessions on transparent public funding of CSOs and monitoring of awarded projects already delivered to public institutional at the national level, the Office for Cooperation with Civil Society also plans to support capacity development for local governments in the upcoming period.

**b) About the ReLOaD programme**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project title** | Regional Programme on Local Democracy in the Western Balkans (ReLOaD) |
| **Atlas ID** | 00095613 |
| **Corporate outcome and output** | UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021; Outcome 1, Output 1.2.1 |
| **Country** | Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia |
| **Region** | Europe and Central Asia/Western Balkans |
| **Date project document signed** | 31 January 2017 |
| **Project dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| February 2017 | January 2020 |
| **Project budget** | **EUR 10,030,000 million (ca USD 10,704,375)**  |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** | **ca USD 6,000,000.00** |
| **Funding source** | **EU, UNDP, Government** |
| **Implementing party** | **UNDP** |

Funded by the EU, the ReLOaD programme supports partnerships between local governments and civil society by scaling-up a successful model of transparent and project-based funding of CSOs introduced by the LOD Project implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2009-2016). As a regional initiative, the ReLOaD is implemented throughout the Western Balkans, including Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia. It focuses on institutionalization of interaction between local governments and CSOs with underlying intention to put in practice and sustain a transparent, development-oriented and project-based approach to funding of CSOs by local governments, thus contributing to realization of legitimate local priorities in line with local development strategies.

The **overall objective/impact** of the ReLOaD is to strengthen participatory democracies and the EU integration process in the Western Balkans by empowering civil society to actively take part in decision making and by stimulating an enabling legal and financial environment for civil society. The **specific objective/outcome** of the programme is to strengthen partnerships between local governments and civil society in the Western Balkans by introducing transparent and project-based funding of CSOs from local government budgets towards greater civic engagement in decision-making and improvement of local service delivery. The programme **outputs/results** focus on promotion and institutionalization of transparent and project-based funding of CSOs by local governments, capacity building of local governments and CSOs and their effective interaction, improved service delivery by CSOs to the most vulnerable and excluded groups and facilitating cross-country thematic networking of CSOs and local government representatives. *Detailed outline of the Programme Result Framework is available in Annex 1.*

Partnership: Project Board, bringing together representatives of EU and UNDP, is responsible for providing strategic guidance and overseeing the ReLOaD implementation. Due to regional complexity, the ReLOaD institutionalizes the National Board of Partners within its overall governance structure, enabling systemic and meaningful engagement of relevant stakeholders in each participating IPA beneficiary. The ReLOaD partners with 53 local governments in six IPA beneficiaries. Additionally, there is an Advisory Group in each of the IPA beneficiaries, bringing together representatives of civil society (through TACSO Local Advisory Groups and/or Resources Centres) academia, etc., to provide advice to the national Board of Partners. *Overview of key stakeholders and partners and their roles in evaluation is provided in Annex 2.*

Target groups and beneficiaries: Final beneficiaries of the ReLOaD are grass-root CSOs, citizens and local communities in participating local governments. It is expected that by the end of the programme, approximately 38,000 citizens including, socially excluded population groups, youth and women will directly benefit from the programme assistance.

Main achievements: In two years of the programme implementation, 25 new local governments in six IPA beneficiaries adopted the mechanism for transparent disbursement of public funds for CSO based on the [LOD Methodology for Allocation of Funds to Civil Society Organizations](http://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia_and_herzegovina/en/home/library/poverty/lod-methodology-for-allocation-of-funds-to-civil-society-organiz.html) (12 in Albania, 12 in Bosnia and Herzegovina and 1 Montenegro). As a result of enhanced partnership between local governments and CSOs, 183 civil society projects were supported in the areas of culture, education, environment, social inclusion, volunteerism, youth, poverty reduction, gender and sport, benefitting 22,000 citizens.

Programme relevance and alignment: The programme is aligned with the pertaining EU strategies, national and UNDP development frameworks and goals (UNDAF, CPD). It contributes to targets set within the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions. *Overview of relevant documentation is provided in Annex 3.*

## Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

**a) Purpose**

The purpose of the Project Evaluation is to provide an impartial review of the ReLOaD programme in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, overall performance, management and achievements. The information, findings, lessons learned and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used by the Project Board/Board of Partners, UNDP, EU and by the implementing partners to strengthen the remaining Project implementation and inform future programming.

**b) Objective**

The evaluation objective is to examine the overall performance of the ReLOaD, its results, inputs and activities, and how the outputs delivered added value to local governments and CSOs. In a substantive analysis of the effectiveness of the project approach and feedback from beneficiaries, the evaluation should assess cause and effect relations within the programme, identifying the extent to which the observed changes can be attributed to the ReLOaD. In addition, this evaluation aims to provide forward-looking recommendations to the EU and UNDP in the field of local government-civil society relations and promotion of CSO role in service delivery.

**c) Scope**

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the planned specific objective/outcome and results/outputs have been achieved since the beginning of the programme and likelihood for their full achievement by the end of the programme in July 2020 (based on the Programme Document/Description of the Action and its results framework). The evaluation will look into the overall programme performance and results, covering six IPA beneficiaries where the programme is implemented (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia).

Specifically, the evaluation will review, evaluate and make recommendation regarding the implementation of the ReLOaD programme in 53 partner local governments in six IPA beneficiaries. It will look into critical programme’s aspects, such as partnership between CSOs and local authorities and institutionalization of the methodology for transparent and project-based funding of CSOs from local government budget. To the extent possible, it will also consider the relevance and influence of 200 implemented CSO projects on the individuals and groups within the programme’s localities (online survey of the programme beneficiaries).

Finally, the evaluation will look into the programme processes, innovations, strategic partnerships and linkages in the regional context, that proved critical in producing the intended results/outputs and the factors that facilitated and/or hindered the progress in achieving the results/outputs, both in terms of the external environment and risks, as well as internal, including: weaknesses in programme design, management, human resource skills, and resources.

## Evaluation criteria and key questions

The ReLOaD evaluation is to answer the following questions, so as to determine the programme’s relevance, performance, results, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, including lessons learned and forward-looking recommendations. The evaluation questions are summarized below.

**Relevance**

* Were the programme’s objectives relevant to the needs of the IPA beneficiaries, having in mind political, social and institutional context of the Western Balkans, and what are its potentials to adequately contribute to development processes in the future?
* To what extent is the programme aligned with the relevant national development priorities of the IPA beneficiaries, the EU enlargement policy/accession agenda and UNDP strategic objectives and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 - peace, justice and strong institutions?
* To what extent does the programme contribute to gender equality, empowerment of women and human rights of target groups?

**Effectiveness**

To what extent were the programme activities implemented and intended results and the specific objective/outcome achieved? What are the main programme accomplishments?

* What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the programme’s interventions? This may, inter alia, include an overview of the number of beneficiaries benefiting from CSO grant awarded projects implemented in local communities, CSO/citizen participation at the level of local community, level of local government co-financing, etc.
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended specific objective/outcome and outputs/results?
* To what extent has the programme contributed to strengthening partnership between CSOs and local authorities?
* How effective were results in partner local governments, considering bifurcated approach to selection in Bosnia and Herzegovina? What were the differences in terms of effectiveness between local governments that participates in a more than one programmatic cycle, or new partner local governments?
* To what extent has the programme managed to institutionalize and anchor the methodology for allocation of financial resources from local governments’ budgets to CSOs?
* To what extent and through what mechanisms has the programme managed to promote participatory decision making and inclusiveness of civil society in transparent and project-based funding of civil society organizations from local government budgets?
* To what extend has the programme outreached marginalized groups (i.e. youth, persons with disabilities, returnees, internally displaced, minorities…) and supported gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment?
* How effective was the programme’s interaction with other local level programmes/projects, specifically other similar EU-funded initiatives in order to trigger synergies maximizing development results?

**Efficiency**

* Have resources (financial, human, technical) been allocated strategically to achieve the programme results?
* Are there any weaknesses in programme design, management, human resource skills, and resources?

**Impact**

* What are the programme effects and impact in terms of implemented CSO projects, both in qualitative, as well as quantitative terms, on the overall improvement of quality of life of citizens in targeted areas?
* What are the main benefits (qualitative and quantitative) for beneficiaries’ groups of CSO projects?
* To what extent are key stakeholders/final beneficiaries satisfied with the programme implementation, specifically in terms of the partnership support and what are specific expectations for the potential follow-up assistance?
* What are the overall programme effects and impact in relation to local governments’ capacities to improve CSO funding procedures, the culture of transparency and participatory decision-making?
* To what extent the programme has elevated cooperation between partner local governments and civil society?

**Sustainability**

* To what extent are the programme outputs/results sustainable? How could programme results be further sustainably projected and expanded, having in mind the potential future contribution of mechanism for funds disbursement for CSOs?
* To what extent has the programme approach (intervention strategy) managed to create ownership of the key national stakeholders?
* To what extent have the capacities of CSOs been strengthened to sustain the results of the programme? Which are, in this regard, challenges to overcome or potentials to be unlocked in the future?
* What would be directions to expand positive effects of the programme’s concept in the area of social services, inclusion and gender equality in the future?
* What would be future priority interventions to ensure long-term sustainability of the programme’s achievements and contribute to further development of civil society and improved cooperation between local governments and CSOs?

The evaluation needs to assess the degree to which the programme initiatives have supported or promoted gender equality, a rights-based approach, and human development. In this regard, [United Nations Evaluation Group’s guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation should be consulted.](file://C:\Users\azorlak\Desktop\The%20evaluation%20need%20to%20assess%20the%20degree%20to%20which%20UNDP%20initiatives%20have%20supported%20or%20promoted%20gender%20equality,%20a%20rights-based%20approach,%20and%20human%20development.%20In%20this%20regard,%20United%20Nations%20Evaluation%20Group’s%20guidance%20on%20Integrating%20Human%20Rights%20and%20Gender%20Equality%20in%20Evaluation%20should%20be%20consulted.)

## Methodology

Based on the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml), [UNEG Norms and Stand for Evaluations (2016)](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914) and in consultations with UNDP Country Office, the evaluation will be participatory, involving relevant stakeholders.

The International Evaluation Consultant (the Consultant) will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as a part of the evaluation Inception Report. The proposed methodology may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the Project Evaluation, exploring specific, gender sensitive data collecting and analytical methods and tools applicable in the concrete case. The Consultant is expected to creatively combine the standard and other evaluation tools and technics to ensure maximum reliability of data and validity of the evaluation findings.

Standard UNDP evaluation methodology would suggest the following data collecting methods:

* Desk review:The Consultant will conduct a detailed review of the programmatic materials and deliverables including the Programme Document/Description of the Action, theory of change and results framework, monitoring and programme quality assurance reports, annual workplans, consolidated progress reports etc. *An indicative list of documents for desk review is provided in Annex 3.*
* Key informant interviews: The Consultant will interview representatives of main institutional partners, EU and UNDP, other relevant stakeholders (e.g. Advisory Group) and donors and in all six IPA beneficiaries. For the interviews, the Consultant is expected to design evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability criteria, according to different stakeholders to be interviewed. *An indicative list of main stakeholders that may be considered for meetings is provided in Annex 2.*
* Meetings / focus group discussions with local governments and CSOs: 2 - 3 site visits per IPA beneficiary will be arranged to meet with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders and review results of the programme;
* Other methodologies, as appropriate, such as case studies, statistical analysis, social network analysis, etc.[[3]](#footnote-4)

As an integral part of the evaluation report and specifically under the impact criteria, the Consultant will review the programme effects and impact on its target groups. In this context and using the online survey, the consultancy is expected to gain insights from both the partner local governments and CSOs regarding the importance of grassroot CSO projects and the work of the CSOs in general in their communities.

**Stakeholders involvement:** During the evaluation process, the Consultant is expected to meet senior representatives of the UNDP, EU and the programme team, key partners and stakeholders in all six IPA beneficiaries. Initial briefing and evaluation debriefing to obtain the critical feedback on the evaluation report, are envisaged. To assess programme performance, approach and modalities, the Consultant will meet with key programme partners and stakeholders, members of national Boards of Partners (respective ministries of local governments, offices for cooperation with civil society, associations of cities and municipalities in all six IPA beneficiaries). In addition, the views of representatives of partner local governments and CSOs awarded under the ReLOaD grant scheme will be considered to obtain critical insight and information on the programme activities and results. As relevant, the Consultant will also meet with representatives of other UNDP-implemented initiatives as well as EU-funded projects (such as ROMACTED, TACSO, etc.) active in the field of civil society development. During these meetings, it would be important to record and accumulate inputs necessary not only for the programme evaluation, but also to highlight recommendations and advise on potential programme follow-up phase.

The expected duration of the assignment is up to 47 work days, with ca 27 days in the IPA beneficiaries (5 days in Albania, 6 days in Bosnia and Herzegovina and 4 days in the remaining IPA beneficiaries) in the period May/July 2019.

## Evaluation tasks / deliverables

Following the initial briefing and a detailed desk review, the Consultant will be responsible for delivering the following products and tasks:

* **Inception Report (10-15 pages)** will be presented before the evaluation starts, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by proposing methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. The Inception Report should elaborate an **evaluation matrix** (*provided in Annex 4*) for the ReLOaD programme and propose a schedule of tasks, activities and evaluation deliverables. The Evaluation Inception Report should follow the structure proposed in the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, p. 22-23.](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf)
* **Evaluation and data collection mission:** Upon the approval of the Inception Report and the evaluation work plan by the UNDP, the Consultant is expected to carry out the programme evaluation, including review of effects of CSO projects in target local communities in six IPA beneficiaries. To collect data and insights on the programme, the Consultant will undertake one field mission per IPA beneficiary and have meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders, including government, CSO, EU and UNDP representatives. UNDP will provide support in organization of meetings and logistical arrangements as necessary.
* **Draft Evaluation Report:** Based on the findings generated through desk review and data collection missions, the Consultant will prepare and submit the Draft Evaluation Report to the UNDP team and key stakeholders for review. *Structure of the Report is outlined in Annex 5.*
* **Evaluation review process** (and eventual dispute settlement): Comments, questions, suggestions and requests for clarification on the evaluation draft will be submitted to the Consultant and addressed in the agreed timeframe. The Consultant should reply to the comments through the **evaluation audit trail document**[[4]](#footnote-5). If there is disagreement in findings, these should be documented through the evaluation audit trail, while effort should be made to come to an agreement.
* **Evaluation debriefings:** will be held with UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina (contracted party that administers the programme), EU representatives and other key stakeholders to present main findings and recommendations either face-to-face or in a form of a Skype briefing. In addition, short briefings on immediate findings with UNDP sr. management will be considered after completion of field work in each IPA beneficiary.
* **Evaluation Report** (maximum 50 pages of the main body) should be logically structured, contain data and evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. Finally, based on the evaluation findings and in a distinct report section, the Consultant will provide **forward-looking actionable recommendations,** outlining key strategic priorities to be addressed in the potential next phase of the programme.[[5]](#footnote-6)

## Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation will be conducted by an International Evaluation Consultant. The Consultant is expected to provide an independent and substantiated review of the programme achievements; capture underperformance; review coherence and inter-connectivity among initiatives within the programme; assess partnership strategy; capture feedback from beneficiaries of assistance provided by the programme, in light of development results; last but not least – recommend improvements that may be undertaken to ensure quality outcome, and provide strategic forward-looking recommendations, outlining pathways for the period beyond this programme phase.

**a) Competencies**

**Core values**

* Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

**Core competencies**

* Demonstrates professional competence to meet responsibilities and post requirements and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
* Results-Orientation: Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals, generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations;
* Communication: Excellent communication skills, including the ability to convey complex concepts and recommendations, both orally and in writing, in a clear and persuasive style tailored to match different audiences;
* Team work: Ability to interact, establish and maintain effective working relations with a culturally diverse team;
* Client orientation: Ability to establish and maintain productive partnerships with national partners and stakeholders and pro-activeness in identifying of beneficiaries and partners’ needs and matching them to appropriate solutions.

**b) Required qualifications for the International Evaluation Consultant**

* Academic Qualifications/Education
	+ Advanced university degree in social sciences, economics, public administration, regional development/planning, or other sciences sustainable development;
* Experience
	+ At least 5 years of extensive project/programme evaluation expertise and experience, with evaluations in the area of local governance and local development;
	+ Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
	+ Expertise in the area of local governance/public administration and/or civil society development;
	+ General understanding and knowledge of the political/administrative and development context of the Western Balkan region;
	+ Previous working experience in the Western Balkan region is an asset;
	+ Proven analytical skills and ability to conceptualize and write concisely and clearly.
* Languages Requirements
* Fluency in English language.
* Other
* Excellent computer skills (MS Office applications) and ability to use information technologies as a tool and resource.

## Evaluation deliverables and timelines

| **Deliverables** | **# of days per task for Consultant** | **Tentative due date** | **Location** | **Responsible****Parties** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial meeting with the Project owners and desk review; | 5 | 10 August | Online | Consultant/Evaluation Reference Groups |
| Inception report including detailed evaluation work-plan; | 2 | 20 August  | Online | Consultant |
| Evaluation and data collection mission across the Western Balkans; | 27 | 04 October | Western Balkans | Consultant |
| Debriefing session held; | 1 | 10 October | Sarajevo or online | Consultant/Evaluation Reference Group |
| Draft evaluation report; | 7 | 17 October | Online | Consultant |
| Evaluation review process; | 0 | 25 October | Online | Evaluation Reference Group |
| Submission of the Project Evaluation Report. | 5 | 31 October | Online | Consultant |

## 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 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. The Consultant should be free from any conflict of interest related to this evaluation.[[6]](#footnote-7)

## Implementation arrangements and reporting relations

The Consultant will report to the Rural and Regional Sector Leader and the ReLOaD Regional Manager. A UNDP Evaluation Focal Point will be assigned to oversee and support the overall evaluation process. In addition, an evaluation reference group will be formed to provide critical and objective inputs throughout the evaluation process to strengthen the quality of the evaluation. The CO Senior Management will take responsibility for the approval of the evaluation report.

## TOR annexes

Annex 1. ReLOaD Logical Framework

Annex 2. Indicative list of the main stakeholders and their roles in evaluation

Annex 3. List of documents to be considered for the evaluation desk review

Annex 4. Required Evaluation Matrix Template

Annex 5. Standard outline for an evaluation report

## Procurement Notice

1. **Sourcing of candidates (please complete applicable section):**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Advertisement: | Yes: ☒No: ☐ | If yes: Dates (from 28-June- to 15-July-2019): Local website:Global website: | Yes:☒ No: ☐Yes:☒ No: ☐ |
| Sourcing through Registry: | Yes: ☐No: ☒ | Direct contracting | Yes:☐ No: ☒ |

1. **Documents to be included when submitting the proposals**

|  |
| --- |
| Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications and interest:1. Most recent CV, including reference to similar evaluations conducted by the candidate;
2. Financial proposal;
3. Proposal (outlining the specific design and methods for the evaluation):
* Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work;
* Providing a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work;
* the methodology should present the Consultant’s approach, proposed detailed methods, scope and evaluation criteria and questions;
* the methodology should apply a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate data;
* the methodology should include the filled in evaluation matrix (Annex 3);
* the methodology should explain the data collection tool/s to be used.
 |

1. **Financial Proposal**

|  |
| --- |
| **Contract is based on the lump sum fee**The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in USD, 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 (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days). **Travel:** All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. |

**Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Best value for money approach[[7]](#footnote-8): | Yes: [x] No: [ ]  | If yes, please specify percentage of technical and financial evaluations[[8]](#footnote-9)  | 70% of technical evaluation30% of financial evaluation  |
| Lowest evaluated offer[[9]](#footnote-10): | Yes: [ ] No: [x]  |  |  |

1. **Technical evaluation criteria**

Evaluation will be conducted through:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Interview | Yes:[x]  No: [ ]  |
| Desk review | Yes:[x]  No: [ ]  |

1. Qualification Requirements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight***  | ***Max. Points*** |
| Criterion A: - Advanced university degree in social sciences, economics, public administration, regional development/planning, or other sciences sustainable development. | 40% (20% for BSc degree, 30% for master’s degree, and PhD degree 40%) | 40 |
| - At least 5 years of extensive project/programme evaluation expertise and experience, with evaluations in the area of local governance and local development;- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies | 60%  | 60 |
| Total | 100% | 100 |

 *Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points would be considered for Technical Evaluation*

1. Technical Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight***  | ***Max. Point*** |
| *Technical* | *Total technical 100%* |  |
| *Criterion A:* * Qualification Score
 | *10%* | *10* |
| *Criterion B:* * Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Expertise in the area of local governance/public administration and/or civil society development;
* Previous working experience in the Western Balkan region is an asset
 | *20%* | *20* |
| *Criterion C:* * Proposal (outlining the specific design and methods for the evaluation):
	+ Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work;
	+ Providing a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work;
	+ the methodology should present the Consultant’s approach, proposed detailed methods, scope and evaluation criteria and questions;
	+ the methodology should apply a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to validate and triangulate data;
	+ the methodology should include the filled in evaluation matrix (Annex 3);
	+ the methodology should explain the data collection tool/s to be used.
 | *30%* | *30* |
| *Criterion D:*Interview results  | *40%* | *40* |

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

1. Final Evaluation

The final evaluation score will be based on Combined Scoring Method where technical evaluation will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the financial offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.

1. \* For the European Union, all references to Kosovo should be understood in full compliance with Resolution 1244 (1999) and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence. For the United Nations, references to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Funded by the EU, the Reinforcement of Local Democracy (LOD) Project was initiated in 2009 to strengthen inclusiveness and transparency in municipal funding for CSOs. The project introduced competitive project-based funding, inciting CSOs to professionalize and provide specific services, in accordance with local development priorities. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Annex 2. Summary of common data-collection methods/sources used in UNDP evaluations](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Template available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf>, p. 25 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Evaluation Report Template available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf>, p.49 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, Box 7. Sources of conflict of interest in evaluation](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. The financial proposal should account for at least 30% of the total score [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. When using this method, the award of a contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as both: (a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and (b) offering the lowest price/cost [↑](#footnote-ref-10)