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1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW**

**1.1 Project factsheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project name** | Sustainable Local Development in Rural Areas of Chernivtsi and Odesa Oblasts |
| **Project ID** | 83522; ADA Project Number 8320-01/2016 |
| **Post title**  | National Consultant to conduct Decentralized Project Final Evaluation |
| **Country / Duty Station** | Home-based  |
| **Expected places of travel** | Chernivtsi and Odesa Oblast |
| **Duration of Initial Contract** | July 15, 2019 |
| **Assignment Quality Assurer** | Yuliya Petsyk, UNDP M&E Specialist |
| **Assignment Coordinator** | Mustafa Sait-Ametov, Programme Coordinator  |
| **Expected Duration of Assignment** | 30 working days within the timeframe July – August, 2019 |
| **Payment arrangements** | Lump Sum (payments are linked to deliverables) |
| **Administrative arrangements** | All working arrangements to be provided by the Consultant. The Consultant will receive all required information from UNDP, including project documents (electronical or paper format), analytical papers and other relevant documents |
| **Selection method** | Technically compliant offer and lowest price |

* 1. **Project background and context**

The project ‘Sustainable Local Development in Rural Areas of Chernivtsi and Odesa Oblast’ is funded by Austrian Development Agency (ADA) and has an execution period from 15 December 2016 – 14 September 2019. The Project’s primary objective is the improvement of the wellbeing and living standards of the most disadvantaged rural women and men in Chernivtsi and Odesa oblasts of Ukraine.

The project outcome is sustainable and inclusive socio-economic development at the local level promoted by strengthening participatory local governance and encouraging community-based initiatives in two oblasts of Ukraine (Chernivtsi and Odesa).

The project aims to achieve two outputs: 1) strengthened capacity of local communities, local authorities and universities in applying community led development, participatory governance and service delivery (Output 1); 2) small farm and non-farm business development in rural and semi-urban areas promoted (Output 2). The Project builds on the UNDP ‘s experience in community development and community mobilization, implemented through Community-Based Approach to Development UNDP-EU initiative (2008-2017).

The project consists of two components: Component 1 - promotion community-based to local governance (Output 1) and Component 2 - support to small economic initiatives (Output 2).

The direct target group under Component 1 includes people residing in at least 18 local communities. Under Component 2, direct target group includes people from at least 14 communities where non-farm related business initiatives are to be implemented. Indicatively, 50 percent of beneficiaries are supposed to be women, 30 percent – elderly people, and 20 percent – children and youth. The project worked with both newly Amalgamated Territorial Communities (ATCs), as a result of the Ukraine’s ongoing decentralization reform, and local communities that have not voluntarily amalgamated yet.

The Project worked with the following partners:

* At the local level: community organizations, NGOs, village councils, business support organization.
* At the ATC level: with newly established ATC councils and their executive bodies.
* At rayon level: rayon councils and rayon state administration, rayon resource centers.
* At regional level: oblast state administrations, oblast councils, business support organizations, association of local and regional authorities of Ukraine, universities (one partner university in each oblast).

The UNDP signature methodology of social mobilization employs established standards and checklists for assessing community participation, decision-making and leadership. It ensures the inclusion of the entire community with a particular focus on empowering the most vulnerable (people with disabilities, families with many children, orphans, lonely elderly people, internal displaced people etc.). Sustainability is ensured through the local ownership of the development process. The social mobilization process is a multi-stage process of building local knowledge and capacity needed to improve the living standards and forms an integral in developing everyday practices of inclusive, participatory and democratic local governance.

1. **PURPORSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

UNDP seeks to conduct a decentralized final project evaluation. The nature of the final evaluation is largely a management tool to provide project teams and stakeholders with an account of results received at the time of the reporting, assess project progress against initial plans, project document and cost-sharing agreement, highlight important lessons learnt, demonstrate sustainability of the results and ownership of the project by the beneficiaries. The main objective of the evaluations is to assess the efficacy of the project design, relevance of the project outputs, specific contributions and impact, efficiency and effectiveness of the project’s approach, and sustainability of the intervention of the project “Sustainable Local Development in Rural Areas of Chernivtsi and Odesa Oblasts”. The purpose of the evaluation is to study the demand in targeted communities for similar initiatives, analyse the implementation of the project in 2016-2019 against the planned results and draw conclusions and lessons learned as well as recommendations for similar initiatives, carried out by UNDP. The evaluation will highlight strengths, weaknesses/gaps, good practices and provide recommendations for similar initiatives on rural development in Ukraine.

This decentralized evaluation will assess project performance against the review criteria, as outlined in UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, based on OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**.

The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the ‘Sustainable Local Development in Rural Areas of Chernivtsi and Odesa Oblasts’ Project. Given the nature of the evaluation, the Evaluator will: a) compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project’s objectives, as well as b) draw lessons learnt and provide clear recommendations for similar initiatives in Ukraine.

The evaluation will be carried out in Chernivtsi and Odesa regions in communities, covered by the Project’s activities throughout July – August 2019 (30 working days in total).

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**
2. **RELEVANCE**

The report will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

* Country context: how relevant was the project to the interventions target groups, including Government’s needs and priorities? To what extent was the project aligned with the policies and strategies of the Government, SDGs as well as UNDP/UNDAF country programme strategy?
* Target groups: To what extent was the project relevant to address the needs of community members in rural communities in the realm of 1) promotion of a community based and inclusive approach lo local development) and 2) support to small farm and non-farm economic initiatives (with a special focus on women empowerment and vulnerable groups (elderly people, youth). What is the demand for these types of initiatives in the targeted rural areas in Chernivtsi and Odesa oblasts?
* Does the project remain relevant considering the changing environment in face of climate change, while taking into consideration the risks/challenges mitigation strategy? Was there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?
1. **EFFECTIVENESS**
* Was the overall performance of the project carried out with reference to its respective project document/cost-sharing agreement, strategy, objectives and indicators?
* What are the results achieved beyond the logical framework? What were the supporting factors? What are the main lessons learned from the partnership strategies and what are the possibilities of replication and scaling-up?
* Have the project sufficiently mainstreamed gender and human rights concerns in the activities? What is the anticipated influence of the intervention on human rights and gender equality? What measures can be taken up to improve the involvement of stakeholders, gender equality, social inclusion, human rights and environmental protection in similar initiatives?
1. **EFFICIENCY**
* Was the project cost-effective? Was the project using the least cost options? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the relevant outputs and outcomes?
* Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected period? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results?
* Was the project management, coordination and monitoring efficient and appropriate? Did the monitoring consider gender equality and women empowerment issues, as well as social inclusion and human rights, environmental protection and climate change?
* Are the criteria and governance aspects related to the selection of beneficiaries and partner institutions appropriate?
* Have there been sufficient cooperation and exchange of information between the components of the project? How do they correspond to each other and contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda? Was the project building upon/seeking synergies with existing programmes and strategies in order to maximize impact, efficiently allocate resources and avoid duplications?
1. **SUSTAINABILITY**
* To what extent are project results (impact, if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project ends? Define the areas that produced the most sustainable results, and the most promising areas requiring further support and scaling-up in the course of future interventions.
* Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives?
* Is the project’s approach likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated and increasingly contribute to the inclusive gender responsive socio-economic development at the local level after project ends? Define which of the platforms, networks, relationships development in the framework of the Project that have the highest potential for further scaling up and/or replication.
* Was environmental sustainability considered in the project design and measures accordingly implemented / instruments put in place to ensure that no-harm is caused to the environment and natural resources are used sustainably?
* Which social or political risks have challenged the achievements of projects results and its sustainability? Has this appropriately been addressed by the project?
* To what extent were capacity development initiatives for partner organizations adequate to ensure sustainable improvements for women, men and vulnerable groups? What can additionally be done to improve the sustainability of the project?
* What are possible priority areas of engagement and recommendations for the possible future projects/initiatives? Findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect gender equality and women empowerment, social inclusion, and environmental protection.
1. **IMPACT**
* Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, institutional changes for individuals, local communities and institutions related to the project?
* Has the project contributed to gender equality, women’s empowerment and protection of human rights, social inclusion and environmental protection in targeted rural areas?
* What sustainable change has project made in the lives of women and men, vulnerable groups, and targeted communities at large? Has there been any ‘spill-over’ effect to other communities or groups in the community?

The final list of evaluation questions and tools to be proposed by the evaluator and agreed with UNDP in the Inception report. All evaluation questions should mainstream gender and will be screened by UNDP’s gender team.

1. **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

**3.1. Methodology**

The evaluator will be required to use few different methods to ensure that data collection and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, such as: desk studies and literature review, quantitative data, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys, most significant change method and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the final evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means, but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be detailed in the Inception report and stated in the final report. All data provided in the report should be disaggregated by gender and types of vulnerabilities. Furthermore, the evaluation methods and sampling frame should address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the project, particularly the most vulnerable ones. Ethical standards are required throughout the evaluation and all stakeholder groups are to be treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with UNDP Country Office (CO), project team, government counterparts, Austrian Development Agency, Austrian Embassy to Ukraine at all stages of the evaluation planning and implementation. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with UNDP strategic priorities, including eradicating poverty, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and building resilience to crises and shocks.

The evaluation of project performance will be carried out against the expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. All indicators in the Logical Framework need to be assessed individually, with final achievements noted. An assessment of the project M&E design, implementation and overall quality should be undertaken, with specific emphasis of whether gender equality and women’s empowerment issues have been considered. The evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including project budget revisions. Project cost and funding data will be required from the project, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. The evaluation also should include value of money aspect – the minimum purchase price (economy) but also on the maximum efficiency and effectiveness of the purchase.

The evaluator is expected to develop and present detailed statement of evaluations methods/approaches in the inception report to show how each objective and evaluation criterion will be assessed.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A Desk review of including, but not limited to:
2. The original project documents, progress reports, action plans, M&E frameworks;
3. Other project-related material produced by the project (such as datasets, publications, audio-visual materials and consultancies reports).
4. Interviews with the relevant UNDP Country Office and the project’s management and staff, Austrian Embassy to Ukraine, and Austrian Development Agency and the various national sub-regional, and local authorities dealing with project activities as necessary, to provide in-depth briefing on the project, its results, context of partnerships with different stakeholders etc. as well as vision for future.
5. Interviews and focus groups discussions with project partners, beneficiaries and other social groups affected by the outcomes of the project. Partners and beneficiaries can be divided into three distinct groups:
	1. Members of local communities, who directly participated in the implementation of micro projects and small non-farm business initiatives;
	2. Government institutions (including but not limited to the Ministry of Regional Development oblast state administrations, oblast councils, amalgamated territorial communities, other);

Debriefing session will be arranged for discussing the evaluation findings, results and recommendations.

**5. Evaluation products (key deliverables)**

The Consultant should provide the following deliverables:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable #** | **Task description** | **Days and timing** | **Payment breakdown** |
| Deliverable #1 | Conduct desk research of the Project’s core documentation (cost-sharing agreements, project documents, annual work plans and progress reports 2016-2019, project implementation plans). The set of documents to be reviewed will be prepared by UNDP.Develop an evaluation methodology and strategy to collect the required data, plans and forms for the interview with partners and counterparts.**Output**: The inception report (with detailed description of the methodology and evaluation matrix, and a workplan) is produced; annotated structure of the report is developed; a toolkit for gathering data (questionnaire and interview plans, a questionnaire for a beneficiary satisfaction survey) is designed to address the review criteria and the principles illustrated above in the document. All documents are submitted to UNDP for final approval. | 5 days,  | 20% |
| Deliverable #2 | Conduct necessary consultations and interviews with the project staff and project partners. Examine how stakeholders assess the project and what their concerns and suggestions are. Clarify issues that emerge from the preliminary analysis of the project and require hard and soft data to substantiate their reasoning. Discuss the existing needs in the field of the private sector development and how the follow-up phase of the project should address them. Collect and analyse feedback from the partners.**Initial findings discussed in a wrap-up session with Project team and UNDP CO** *(can be done on-line via Skype conference)***.** | 10 days,  | 0% |
| Deliverable #3 | Produce a draft report of the evaluation covering all items detailed in the paragraph #2 of the present TOR with definition of the lessons learned and recommendations for the follow-up phase of the project.**Output**: draft of the report produced and submitted for UNDP and ADA comments and ADA Results-Assessment Form for Final Project Evaluation (*UNDP and ADA review will take up to 10 working days*).  | 8 days,  | 40% |
| Deliverable #4 | Collect, review and incorporate comments from UNDP and ADA into the final version of the evaluation report.**Output**: Final evaluation report containing all required annexes indicated in the paragraph #3 of the present TOR, submitted to UNDP for final review and approval. | 7 days,  | 40% |

The detailed structure of the final report should be agreed with UNDP and reflect all key aspects in focus.

The key product expected is a comprehensive evaluation report in English or Ukrainian languages (up to 30 pages without annexes, single spacing, Myriad Pro font, size 11), which includes, but is not limited to, the following components:

* Executive summary (up to 3 pages)
* Introduction
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation approach and methods[[1]](#endnote-1)
* Development context and project background
* Data analysis and key findings and conclusions
* Lessons learned and recommendations for similar interventions (including viable ideas on areas which could be sharpened and further optimized in future interventions)
* Annexes: TOR, ADA Results-Assessment Form for Final Project Evaluation
* list of people interviewed disaggregated by sex, geography and age, interview questions, documents reviewed, audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed, presentations and other knowledge products etc.

**The conclusions** related to the implementation of the project in 2016-2019 should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses, challenges and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically linked to the terminal evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and Austrian Development Agency (ADA).

**The recommendations** for the project should identify how best practices and achievements of the project can be scaled up or proliferated to increase the positive impact of similar intervention on local communities’ development in Ukraine. Also, how theory of change of the project may be adapted/strengthened to be more relevant in the evolving context, based on interviews with project partners and beneficiaries, and desk analysis*.* The recommendations need to be supported by an evidential basis, be credible, practical, action-oriented, and define who is responsible for the action - to have potential to be used in decision-making.

The evaluator should provide a proposed design, methodology of evaluation (methods, approaches to be used, evaluation criterion for assessment of each component to be proposed), detailed work plan and report structure to UNDP prior to the start of fieldwork; these documents and the list of businesses and other stakeholders to visit should be agreed with UNDP. While proposing the methodology, the Consultant should be guided by UNDP approach to project evaluations[[2]](#footnote-1). Payment will be based upon satisfactory completion of deliverables. 100% of the total amount shall be paid upon completion of the Deliverables 1-5.

1. **monitoring/REPORTING requirements**

The consultant will interact with UNDP project and CO staff to receive any clarifications and guidance that may be needed. He/she will also receive all necessary informational and logistical support from UNDP CO and the Project. On a day-to-day basis, consultant’s work will be coordinated with UNDP Programme Coordinator. The satisfactory completion of each of the deliverables shall be subject to endorsement of the UNDP CO Specialist.

The consultant will inform UNDP of any problems, issues or delays arising during the implementation of the assignment and take necessary steps to address them.

The key product expected is a comprehensive evaluation report (*with parameters indicated above in section 2)*

The report must be as free as possible of technical jargon in order to ensure accessibility to its wide and diverse audience. The Report should be prepared in English

All reports and results are to be submitted to the UNDP in electronic form (\*.docx, \*.xlsx, \*.pptx, and \*.pdf or other formats accepted by UNDP).

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations’.

1. **EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS**
* Master’s/Specialist’s degree or equivalent in Economics, Management, Social Sciences, Public Administration, Business Administration or other relevant area;
* Not less than 5 years of proven experience in designing, conducting and leading project or programme in the context of development cooperation, evaluations, providing consultancies and/or monitoring, based on qualitative and quantitative methods;
* Substantive work experience (at least three years) and knowledgeable in the area of socio - economic and community development, human rights and gender equality is required. ,; Experience in rural and agricultural development, environmental protection is preferable, but not mandatory
* Must possess excellent written and oral communication skills with demonstrable experience of analytical reports writing (at least three program/project evaluation documents prepared);
* Fluency in Ukrainian and Russian, and proficient English speaking and writing skills are required.
1. **DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Required |   |
| [x]  | P11 form, including information about past experience in similar projects / assignments and contact details for referees. |
| [x]  | Samples of at least 3 previously prepared program/project evaluation documents |
| [x]  | Financial proposal |
| [x]  | Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP |

1. **FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

[x]  Lump sum contract

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 instalments 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 costs.** Logistics arrangements for any travel or events in Ukraine involving the Consultant will be provided by UNDP Ukraine. Air or train tickets to join duty station/repatriation travel Duty Station will be provided by UNDP Ukraine.

1. **EVALUATION CRITERIA**
* Master’s/Specialist’s degree or equivalent in Economics, Management, Mathematics, Social Sciences, Public Administration, Business Administration or other relevant area – pass/fail;
* Not less than 5 years of proven experience in designing, conducting and leading development evaluations, providing consultancies and/or monitoring, based on qualitative and quantitative methods – pass/fail;
* Substantive work experience (at least 3 years) in socio - economic development, human rights, civil society and community development, private sector development, – pass/fail;
* Excellent written and oral communication skills with demonstrable experience of analytical reports writing (at least 3 program/project evaluation documents prepared) – pass/fail;
* Fluency in Ukrainian and Russian – pass/fail.
* Proficient level in English – pass/fail.
1. **EVALUATION method**

 [x]  **Lowest offer technically qualified**

Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as both:

a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable (fully meeting the TOR provided), and

b) offering the lowest price/cost

1. The Project should be evaluated in accordance with UNDP Evaluation Policy. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)