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**Terms of Reference (Scope of Work)**

**Cross-border Cooperation for Sustainable Peace and Development
FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION**

Country: Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan

Description of Assignment: International Consultant to conduct the Final evaluation of the “The Cross-border Cooperation for Sustainable Peace and Development” Project in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan

Period of assignment/services: Up to 30 working days within February-March 2020 (incl. 3 days for the deskwork and preparation, 12-14 days in-country mission to Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, 10 days for report finalization and presentation to the Country Teams of Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan).

Duty station: Dushanbe, targeted districts in Sughd Province of Tajikistan

Bishkek, targeted districts of Batken province in Kyrgyzstan.

Type of Contract: Individual Consultant (IC)

**INTRODUCTION**

The Cross-border Cooperation for Sustainable Peace and Development (Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan) project was launched in December 2015, for an initial period of 18 months, funded by the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), and extended by the Peacebuilding Fund for 18 month in April 2018 with a completion date in October 2019. The project is implemented by five UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, FAO and UN Women) on both sides of the Kyrgyzstan – Tajikistan border, with the aim to enhance cooperation and trust between communities in pilot Tajik-Kyrgyz village clusters, in order to mitigate immediate risks of renewed cross-border violence. The current project ends at the end of October 2019.

According to the 2018 Peacebuilding Fund Guidelines on Funds Application and Programming, every PBF project has to undertake an independent evaluation. The aim of this evaluation is to assess the results achieved by the project “Cross-border Cooperation for Sustainable Peace and Development” Project in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan in the timeframe April 2018 – October 2019.

**SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The evaluation presents an excellent opportunity to assess the achievements of this project and its overall added value to peacebuilding in cross-border areas in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. The evaluation will be used for learning and accountability, and to contribute to the PBF’s decision-making regarding further engagement on this issue. The evaluation must apply conflict sensitivity to the evaluation methods.

The Evaluation will assess the Project according to standard evaluation criteria, as elaborated below, in line with the OECD DAC Guidelines on Evaluating Peacebuilding in Settings of Conflict and Fragility[[1]](#footnote-1) and United Nations Evaluations Group norms and principles.

* Relevance
	+ The degree to which the objectives are (and continue to be) relevant vis-à-vis the peacebuilding process, i.e. whether they address the key drivers of conflict identified in the conflict analysis.
	+ Whether important peacebuilding gaps exist or opportunities are being missed?
	+ Did the activities and strategies fit the objectives, i.e. is there internal coherence between what the programme is doing and what it is trying to achieve?
	+ To what extent were the interventions relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries?
	+ To what extent have gender and human rights considerations been integrated into the programme design and implementation
* Effectiveness
* To assess the degree to which envisaged outputs and outcomes have been achieved and reported achievements, and whether the project has contributed to a reduction of the drivers of the conflict[[2]](#footnote-2).
* Was the theory of change based on valid assumptions?
* the effectiveness of coordination and co-implementation between the UNCTs on both sides of the border
* the degree of coordination and collaboration with the authorities on both sides of the border
* Assess the degree to which project implementation was flexible and adaptive to the context.
* To what extend did the PBF Project mainstream a gender dimension and support gender-responsive peacebuilding?
* To what extent did the PBF Project complement work with different entities, , and have a strategic coherence of approach?
* How have stakeholders have been involved in the programme’s design and implementation?
* Efficiency
* Assess whether the Project has utilized Project funding as per the agreed work plan to achieve the projected targets.
* Analyze the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and whether this forum is optimally being used for decision making.
* Assess the timeline and quality of the reporting followed by the Project.
* Analyze the performance of the M&E mechanism of the Project and the use of various M&E tools (any socio-economic data available to the project etc.).
* Assess the qualitative and quantitative aspects of management and other inputs (such as equipment, monitoring and review and other technical assistance and budgetary inputs) provided by the project vis-à-vis achievement of outputs and targets.
* Identify factors and constraints, which have affected Project implementation including technical, managerial, organizational, institutional and socio-economic policy issues in addition to other external factors unforeseen during the Project design.
* To what extent did PBF project support achieve the results in its proposed timeline?
* How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the project (including between the two implementing agencies and with stakeholders? Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* How efficient and successful was the project’s implementation approach, including procurement and other activities?
* How efficiently did the project use the project board?
* How well did the project collect and use data to monitor results? How well did it communicate with stakeholders and project beneficiaries on its progress? Did it use data to inform its implementation strategy?
* How well did the project communicate on its implementation and results?
* Overall, did the PBF project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?
* Sustainability and Impact
	+ Assess preliminary indications of the degree to which the Project results are likely to be sustainable beyond the Project’s lifetime (both at the community and government level), and provide recommendations for strengthening sustainability.
	+ Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy?
	+ How strong is the commitment of the Government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives?
	+ How has the project enhanced and contributed to the development of national capacity?
* National ownership
	+ Assess the degree of involvement of national partners, and aligning to existing priorities of the local government in targeted areas
* Lessons learnt/ Conclusions
	+ An analysis of the main lessons learnt in relation to the effectiveness of foreseen strategies and theories of change to achieve a peacebuilding impact
	+ An analysis of the main lessons learnt in relation to the effectiveness of implementation modalities

The review will cover the full period the project has been operational.

Methodology

The evaluation will be summative and will employ a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide/ verify the substance of the findings. The evaluation will be based on gender and human rights principles and adhere to the UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Code of Conduct. Proposals submitted by prospective consultants should outline a strong mixed method approach to data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate gathered information.

Proposals should be clear on the specific role each of the various methodological approaches plays in helping to address each of the evaluation questions. The methodologies for data collection may include but not necessarily be limited to:

Rigorous desk review of documentation supplied by country PBF team including: Project documents, previous evaluations, project reports, key intervention reports and policies, etc. Where possible and relevant more detailed monitoring information will be analysed, such as community monitoring data and activity reporting.[[3]](#footnote-3)

* Key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as appropriate, with major stakeholders (Interviews will be conducted in person or over video connection.) Stakeholders will be selected in close coordination with the UNCTs, and will at minimum include:
* Government authorities with a key responsibility towards the project, including – primarily - relevant authorities at district level
* UN RC, UN PBF, UNCT, PDAs and UN implementing agencies
* Other implementing agencies, such as local NGOs
* Other civil society organisations with no direct role in the project
* Project beneficiaries in the village clusters, i.e. villagers, border guards, youth, women
* Survey of key stakeholders, if relevant and direct observation in the field.
* *Desk research:*
* *Interviews & focus group discussions with stakeholders:*

These interviews can take place on an individual basis or in groups. Especially for the project beneficiaries, focus group discussions are envisaged.

All meetings and conversations will be held only once the appropriate approvals have been obtained, for which the UNCT will take primary responsibility. If approvals cannot be obtained on time, it is possible that some of these stakeholders may not be interviewed.

* *Validation*

The review findings will be presented to the RUNOs in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan to collect feedback on these main findings, and serve as a validation exercise.

Products expected from the evaluation:

1) Inception report with finalized and agreed terms of reference, evaluation matrix, questionnaires and agreed methodology of evaluation (3 working days after beginning of assignment/contract);

2) A comprehensive evaluation report with findings, recommendations, lessons learned.

It is expected that draft report will be submitted to UNDP in two working weeks after in-country mission, and the final report with all comments and recommendations incorporated submitted to UNDP for final endorsement not later that in two working weeks after receipt of consolidated formal feedback with comments to a draft from the UNDP.

The draft Report and Final Reports: The Report should be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The Report should respond in detail to the key focus areas described above.

Presentation: For presenting and discussing the draft final report interactively, the consultants will facilitate a concluding workshop for the Project stakeholders.

**Requirements for expertise and qualifications:**

The review will be conducted by an international consultant. The international consultant should meet the following professional expertise criteria:

* Minimum Master’s degree in a relevant area
* No less than 7 years’ experience of conducting evaluations of strategies, policies and/or development programmes in the area of peacebuilding;
* Knowledge of UN procedures and evaluation strategies will be additional asset;
* Good report writing skills, proven by evidence;
* Familiarity with the political, economic, social and gender situation in Central Asia (preferably Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan) would be an asset
* Fluency in English, knowledge of Russian is an asset.

The international consultant will be responsible for the assessment methodology, coordination within the team and with the UNCTs, and for the overall quality and timely submission of all the deliverables. Additional translator will be provided by the Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan UNDP Offices.

The evaluation will be fully independent, and led by the expert. The expert will ensure inclusive process of evaluation process and work in close coordination with all RUNOs in both countries – UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women, FAO and WFP (at the planning the evaluation, field work and report review process), and will be logistically supported by RUNOs and the Peace and Development Adviser. The RUNOs (coordinated by UNDP) will help facilitate contacts and set up meetings, and organize field visits. The participation of the UN staff in the review is required, as this will provide an instant opportunity for validating the findings and will assist in internalizing the learning. However, the reviewer team does reserve the right to have some meetings without staff from the UN or implementing agencies present.

Time Schedule and Deliverables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tentative time schedule** | **Period (all tbc)** |
| Initial desk research  | 5 Feb  |
| Travel to the region | 10 Feb |
| Interviews in Bishkek, Dushanbe, Batken and Khujand | 12-29 Feb |
| Preliminary analysis  | 1-10 Mar  |
| Validation and Planning Workshop  | 15 Mar  |
| Submission of final report  | 20 Mar  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Due date** | **Payment structure** |
| 1 | An interim report based on initial desk research | 5 Feb  | 20% |
| 2 | A presentation of main findings at the final workshop  | 15 Mar | 40% |
| 3 | A final report, max of 25 pages | 20 Mar  | 40% |

|  |
| --- |
| **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS** |
| **Accountability and reporting:** 1. The Consultant will report to Peace and Development Adviser, UN Tajikistan, Programmes Officers of UNDP Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.
2. All reports should be provided in both printed and electronic versions in English language, with the detailed description of the fulfilled tasks, according to the present Terms of Reference, and the direct contribution of the expert. Analytical documents, reports and notes developed by experts should be attached to the reports as annexes, which will serve as a justification for payment.
 |
| **TRAVEL** |
| This assignment requires travels to the regions of the countries. The tentative schedule is as following:1. In-country mission to Tajikistan – 7 days in total as following:
* Mission in Dushanbe – 2 days
* Travel from Dushanbe to Sogd – 1 day
* Field mission in Sogd province – 4 days
1. In-country mission to Kyrgyzstan – 8 days
* Travel from Tajikistan (Sogd) to Kyrgyzstan (Batken) – 1 day
* Field mission in Batken province – 4 days
* Travel from Batken to Bishkek – 1 day
* Mission in Bishkek – 2 days

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket and daily allowance exceeding UNDP rates. Should the Consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. |
| **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR** |

**Statement of Medical Fitness for Work.**

For an Individual Contractor who is of 62 years of age or older, and on an assignment requiring travel, be it for the purpose of arriving at the duty station or as an integral duty required under the TOR, a full medical examination and statement of fitness to work must be provided. However, this is not a requirement for individuals on RLA contracts

Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

**Inoculations/Vaccinations**

Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP.

**Security Clearance.**

The Consultant should undertake the Basic Security in the Field (BSIF) training and Advanced Security in the Field (ASIF)

tests prior to travelling. These requirements apply for all Consultants, attracted individually or through the Employer.

|  |
| --- |
| **SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS** |

**Contracts based on lump-sum**

The financial proposal shall specify instalments and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables. 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 each of the five instalments’ amounts.

**Preferred Currency of Offer**: United State Dollars (USD)

For local contractors in Kyrgyzstan UNDP shall effect payment in Kyrgyz Som based on the prevailing UN operational rate of exchange on the month of payment. The prevailing UN operational rate of exchange is

available for public from the following link: <http://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.aspx>

|  |
| --- |
| **UNDP CONTRIBUTION**  |

1. UNDP Office vehicles for domestic travel;
2. Arranging field visits to meet with local counterparts and beneficiaries;
3. Project related documents such as Project Document, Annual Work Plans and/or Progress Reports;
4. Security charges are not applicable.
1. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264106802-en.pdf?expires=1570808839&id=id&accname=ocid195767&checksum=E395E7C957BEA0EADC13DACF9A702741>; <https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Reflecting-on-Peace-Practice-RPP-Basics-A-Resource-Manual.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In terms of the achieved outcomes, an important caveat is that this review will not be able within its limited scope and timeframe to provide hard evidence for whether outcomes have been achieved. The review will base itself on existing data where possible, and will complement this with largely anecdotal evidence on these outcomes. For the purpose of this lessons learnt exercise this should be sufficient. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This data will only be included in the desk research when it is in a format that is accessible and relatively easily digestible for the reviewer. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)