



I. Position Information

Title: National Evaluation Specialist to Conduct Final Project Evaluation of the Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts in Kosovo (SAEK) Project II

Department/Unit: Governance and Peacebuilding Portfolio

Reports to: SAEK II Project Manager

Duty Station: Pristina, Kosovo

Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): Kosovo

Duration of Assignment: 20 February – 6 April 2020 (25 days)

Need for presence of IC consultant in office:

☐ **partial**

☐ *intermittent (explain)*

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

Provision of Support Services:

Office space: Yes - partial

Equipment (laptop etc): No

Secretarial/Logistical Services: Yes - responsible SAEK II team members

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

Signature of the Budget Owner:

II. Background Information

The Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts in Kosovo (SAEK II) Project, through an innovative and holistic approach towards anti-corruption, aims to strengthen institutional transparency, accountability and integrity, with a particular focus on empowering citizens through the latest technological tools, access to information, and open participation in decision-making processes.

The project's main objective is to strengthen institutional transparency, accountability and integrity, with a particular focus on empowering citizens and access to information.

An inclusive approach in addressing both of these areas will ensure that the overall impact of the intervention is achieved: institutions with strengthened capacities will be able to better perform their functions and mandate, also due to the increased demand of the public for transparency and accountability, which will result in the desired change; lower corruption, increased public trust and decreased perception of corruption.

The final evaluation of SAEK II Project will analyse the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of project interventions, reviewing how the expected results have been achieved. In addition, the final evaluation report through its conclusions and lessons learned, will provide recommendations for developing future projects in the sector.

III. Objective of the Assignment

The overall objective of this assignment is to conduct a final evaluation of the SAEK II project activities, as per UNDP procedures and SAEK II project document.

IV. Scope of Work and Final Evaluation Questions

The local specialist will work together with the international specialist under direct supervision of the Project Manager, and in close consultation with the Programme team. The project team will provide administrative and logistical support as needed.

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

- In close cooperation with the International Specialist, support a comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents and UNDP evaluation policies and, based on this information, support the draft of an inception report. The local consultant will support the international specialist in selecting the appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation, as well as the work plan and any technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented below;
- Accompany the International Specialist, to the on-site field visits, meetings, discussions, and interviews with relevant stakeholders and project beneficiaries in Kosovo. The Project team will provide the Evaluation Team with a list of stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries to be interviewed for purposes of this evaluation;
- Contribute to the drafting of a final evaluation report containing the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP for purposes of future interventions

The final evaluation report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined below:

- Title and opening pages
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation methodology
- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Report annexes

Evaluation questions:

RELEVANCE:

- Has the project been relevant in terms of the needs and potentials/resources of the key stakeholders and beneficiaries? What were the main circumstantial factors taken into account in the project plans and implementation?
- Was there sufficient local ownership demonstrated?
- Have there been any changes in policies and strategy development that have affected the project? If yes, have necessary revisions and adaptations been designed?
- What, if any, are the areas of relevance for future interventions in the target area?

IMPACT, EFFECTIVENESS, AND EFFICIENCY:

- Has the project been on track to achieve its expected results? What has been achieved?
- What challenges have been faced? What has been done to address the potential challenges/problems?
- Has the project appropriately reached its target groups? Has the project served the needs of vulnerable groups, i.e. women, youth, minorities?
- Have the capacity development measures served the needs and demands of the stakeholders? What has been achieved in institutionalizing the acquired knowledge and skills?
- Have the expected results been clearly defined, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and have they been achieved with the planned approach and resources?
- Have the roles and responsibilities been clearly defined and described?
- How well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? (in comparison to the plan)
- Have the management and administrative arrangements been sufficient to ensure efficient implementation of the project?
- How has the project implemented the commitments to promote ownership, alignment, harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability?

SUSTAINABILITY:

- How has the project ensured sustainability of its results and impacts? (i.e. continuity of developed capacities, use of knowledge, improved practices, etc.)?
- How much has the project lead to a change of behaviours and motivations in terms of paying attention to marginalised and vulnerable population groups?
- What is the evidence of it?
- Has the project's exit strategy ensured sustainability?

IMPACT:

- - Is there evidence of long-lasting desired changes?
- - Has the initiative influenced policy making at different levels?
- - Has the project impacted the desired target actors and how?

- - To what degree the project contributed to the development taken place in regards the project goals?
- - Positive and negative, intended and unintended long-term effects?
- - How did the project support the anti-corruption institutions in improving anti-corruption capacities?
- Stakeholders and Partnership Strategy
- - Who are the major actors and partners involved in the project and how were their roles and interests?
- - Was the partnership strategy effective?
- - To what extent the project contributed to awareness raising and capacity development of the involved partners, the efficiency of partnerships developed and implications on national ownership?

Evaluation:

- - Can the project be evaluated credibly?
- - Were intended results (outputs, outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?
- - Were monitoring systems in place and how effective has it been?
- Theory of Change or Results/Outcome Map
- - What are the underlying rationales and assumptions or theory that defines the relationships or chain of results that lead initiative strategies to intended outcomes?
- - What are the assumptions, factors or risks inherent in the design that may influence whether the initiative succeeds or fails?

Gender

- - What effects were realized in terms of gender equality, if any?
- - Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within project?

V. Methodology and Evaluation Ethics

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

The Evaluation Team is expected to hold interviews and meetings with the relevant staff of UNDP, UNDP SAEK II, main Project partners and beneficiaries (Kosovo Anti-Corruption Agency, Prosecution, Supreme Court, Committee on Legislation, Financial Intelligence Unit, Notary Chamber of Kosovo, Kosovo Bar Association, RoLAG, Internews Kosova, and GAP Institute

The suggested methodology should be compatible with the UNDP approach to evaluations as described in the *Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation*.

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

The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNED '*Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*.' The Evaluation Team must address any critical issues in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers.

VI. Expected Results	Tentative due dates (2020):	Approval by:
Methodology to be applied during the final evaluation, as well as the work plan and technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment is drafted, submitted, and endorsed by UNDP.	27 February (5 days)	Project Manager/Programme Team
Field visits, meetings and interviews in Kosovo are conducted, gathering data to be used in the final evaluation report.	6 March (5 days)	Project Manager/Programme Team
Draft final Evaluation report with the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, a presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP and its partners suggesting possible adjustments for the remaining period of project's implementation is formulated, based on the findings acquired during the field mission to Kosovo and through the relevant project documentation, and submitted.	23 March (10 days)	Project Manager/Programme Team
A Final Evaluation report accounting for the UNDP and stakeholders' feedback on the first draft is produced and validated by UNDP.	3 April (5 days)	Project Manager/Programme Team

VII. Deliverables / Final Products Expected
1. Methodology to be applied during the final evaluation, as well as the work plan and technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment is drafted, submitted, and endorsed by UNDP.

2. Draft Final Evaluation report with the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, a presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP and its partners suggesting possible adjustments for the remaining period of project's implementation is formulated and submitted.
3. A Final Evaluation report accounting for the UNDP and stakeholders' feedback on the first draft is produced and validated by UNDP.

VIII. Requirements and qualifications

Education:

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

Experience:

- At least 3 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level is required.
- Demonstrable experience with evaluation processes for capacity development initiatives in the anti-corruption field;
- Previous similar work experience in Kosovo;
- Solid knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of development interventions is required.

Language requirements:

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

IX. Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Committed to professionalism, impartiality, accountability and integrity;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, ethnicity, and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Demonstrates substantial experience in gender equality. Actively promotes gender equality in all activities;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional Competencies:

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

X. Scope of price proposal and schedule of payments

Remuneration - Lump Sum Amount:

The Contract is based on lump sum remuneration and shall be processed subject to deliverables as

per the schedule listed below:

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

Required Presentation of Offer:

The following documents are required:

- **P11 or Resume (signed)**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

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

- **Financial proposal:** The consultant is expected to provide an all-inclusive lump sum amount/financial proposal (professional fee, travel and other incidentals).

Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer:

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

This TOR is approved by:

Signature: _____

Name and Designation: _____

Date of Signing: _____

Acceptance by the IC holder: _____

20 Feb 2020

