

UNDP Cyprus

EVALUATION REPORT

Final External Evaluation of the “Support to
Cultural Heritage Monuments of great importance
for Cyprus, Phase 6” Project

Funded by the European Union

Implemented by UNDP Cyprus

for an amount of EUR 3.000.000

By: Christian Bugnion de Moreta

Final evaluation report

31st December 2020

Note: the contents of this report reflect the evaluator’s analysis and views and not necessarily those of the commissioning agency

Table of contents

Page

Content

Acronyms and abbreviations.....	3
1. Executive Summary	5
2. Object of Evaluation	7
2.1. Description of the intervention	7
2.2. Context and background	7
2.3. Scale and complexity of the evaluation object.....	9
2.4. Status of implementation of the object	9
3. Purpose, scope and objective of the assessment.....	9
3.1 Main evaluation questions, coverage	10
3.2. Description of the evaluation criteria and performance standards	10
4. Evaluation methodology	11
4.1. Tools and methodology	11
4.2. Limitation regarding data collection	12
5. Findings	12
5.1. Relevance	13
5.1.1. Does the project remain currently relevant?	13
5.1.2. What are the key issues and gaps tackled by the project?	14
5.2. Efficiency	14
5.2.1. Is the project bringing value for money?.....	14
5.2.2. Has the project been efficiently managed?.....	15
5.2.3. How well was the project designed, and how strong is the project logic and theory of change?	15
5.2.4. Did the project have a risk management strategy?.....	16
5.3. Effectiveness.....	16
5.3.1. What are the key results of the project?.....	17
5.3.2. To what extent is the specific objective achieved?	18
5.3.3. To what extent is the overall project objective achieved?.....	19
5.3.4. What are examples of good practice?	19
5.3.5. What capacities have been developed as a result of the project?.....	20
5.3.6. How effective was the partnership strategy?	20

5.4.	Outcome and effects (instead of impact).....	21
5.4.1.	What is the most significant change brought about by the project?	21
5.4.2.	Is there any evidence that the project contributes to confidence building?	21
5.4.3.	To what extent are the stakeholders committed to the project and own it?	22
5.4.4.	Has the project informed policy decision making?	23
5.5.	Sustainability	23
5.5.1.	How much of the project outputs can continue beyond the period of implementation?	23
5.5.2.	What are the project's sustainable achievements?	23
5.5.3.	Are there any needs for replication or scaling-up of the project?	24
5.6.	Cross cutting themes	24
5.6.1.	To what extent was the project gender responsive?	24
5.6.2.	Was a gender focus applied during project implementation?	24
6.	Conclusions	24
7.	Recommendations	25

Annexes:

- Evaluation ToR
- List of Key Informants interviewed
- Bibliography
- Preliminary findings presentation
- Interview protocol

Acronyms and abbreviations

AB:	Advisory Board
C-19:	COVID-19
DAC :	Development Assistance Committee
DoA:	Description of the Action
EU:	European Union
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
HYA:	Heritage Youth Ambassadors
KII:	Key Informant Interview
M&E:	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSC:	Most Significant Change
OECD:	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PSC:	Project Steering Committee
RBM:	Results-Based Management
RF:	Results Framework
TC:	Technical Committee
TCCH:	Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage
TF:	Task Force
ToC:	Theory of Change
ToR :	Terms of Reference
UNDG:	United Nations Development Group
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG :	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFICYP:	United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

1. Executive Summary

The UNDP has hired an independent consultant to undertake the Final Evaluation of the Project: “Support to Cultural Heritage Monuments of great importance (Phase 6)”. The Contribution Agreement for Phase 6 was signed on 17 September 2018 and the implementation period started on 1 May 2018 for 34 months and will be ending on 28 February 2021. The total project budget is Euros 3.000.000 fully funded by the EU. This final evaluation is undertaken by UNDP as it is contractually foreseen, and coincides with the departure of the UNDP Head of Office. Her role was key in connecting the different stakeholders and finding a mechanism through which all parties could work together to implement immovable cultural Heritage (CH) interventions. Thus, it is also important to have this final evaluation as a legacy to the work undertaken to date by UNDP with the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH) and with the support of the EU.

The evaluation also formulates recommendations that may be useful for future phases or future interventions in the field of CH. However, the importance of the context is underlined as is the complexity and sensitivity required when working through a non-legal entity such as the TCCH.

The objective of this final evaluation is to provide an assessment of the project performance throughout its implementation period. The criteria for the evaluation are standard evaluation criteria defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG): relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact. The evaluation is also requested to assess the following themes: gender, theory of change, stakeholders and partnership strategy.

The final external evaluation has three purposes:

- 1) To provide a summative evaluation of the performance and results to date,
- 2) To identify good practices and lessons to be carried forward into potential future interventions with similar outcomes
- 3) To provide recommendations, where relevant, on aspects which could be improved

The scope of the final evaluation is the entire implementation period of the Project Phase 6 since its start on 1 May 2018 until 30 November 2020.

The audience is primarily the UNDP Programme Office in Cyprus, but it may also be shared with the donor, the TCCH and the Advisory Board (AB), as well as with other UN bodies. As an external evaluation and in line with the UNDP evaluation policy, it may be placed in the public domain on the Evaluation Resource Center. (<https://erc.undp.org/>)

The evaluation used a combination of methods:

- a) Documentary review of project outputs and reports submitted by the UNDP referenced in the bibliographical annex;
- b) 23 Individual Key Informant Interviews (KII) with: TCCH members (11), AB coordinators (2), the EU (2), UNDP (6), and UN bodies (2). The total interview time was 1,500 minutes or 25 hours, yielding an average of 65 minutes per interview. A total of 11 women and 12 men were interviewed.

- c) 2 Focus group Discussions (FGD) with the Heritage Youth Ambassadors (HYA) into two gender-disaggregated groups: 2 men (55 min.) and 7 women (80 min.)

All evaluation respondents identified in the inception report except one were available for interview during the data collection phase.

The main findings are that the project was and remains highly relevant to the needs of the primary stakeholders and of both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities. Future phases and/or interventions are strongly encouraged as the work is not complete in terms of the number of CH sites and in terms of its contribution to the overall objective. The project has been efficiently managed despite a constraining environment amplified by the COVID-19 pandemic and challenging conditions related to the number and level of complexity of the project's interventions. The project was highly effective in reaching the expected specific objective. It surpassed the targets in quantifiable terms and was appraised to be good or very good by respondents. A key strength was the very positive and trusting relationship between project partners, UNDP, EU and the TCCH. The commitment, dedication, attitude and problem-solving approach was critical in obtaining the results. At the higher level, there is evidence that the project is contributing to confidence building, but it lacks the tools to report properly on it. The main challenge is to define a use-and-maintenance mechanism for the future, as preserved/restored CH monuments and sites require proper maintenance. The principle is shared amongst TCCH members, but a workable solution is yet to be defined, which will also influence the way in which future phases will unfold. Sustainability is directly linked to the solution of the use-and-maintenance issue, which is a particularly sensitive one. Gender needs to be more strongly embedded in the project, and UNDP is aware of this and has taken steps to address this issue. Overall, the project is highly successful and is achieving its objectives. New initiatives such as the Heritage Youth Ambassadors require further consolidation as it has been a challenging endeavour under the current C-19 limitations, but the initiative is widely considered to yield great potential. The replacement of the UNDP Head of Office is a concern given her specific skill set and role in creating a workable mechanism to implement CH projects with the TCCH/AB and the donor. In conclusion the project was well managed and implemented and has largely succeeded to meet the targets specified under the results framework for phase 6 contained in the Description of the Action (DoA).

The key recommendations to UNDP are:

1. UNDP's replacement as Head of Office should have similar skills and diplomatic capacity as the incumbent. A presential hand-over should be preferred.
2. Review with the EU the necessary level of resources required for UNDP in light of higher volume of projects and increased complexity of the interventions.
3. Consider discussing with the TCCH priority interventions for the next phase based on communities that accept use-and-maintenance solutions approach (which remains to be defined) with a 3-year maintenance fund built into the project intervention
4. Commission targeted and specifically tailored perception surveys at the end of each phase to obtain evidence of the results on confidence building and thus gain a long-term vision of the impact of the project through its different phases
5. Take a more strategic approach to communications to contribute to higher level results
6. Discuss with the TCCH the type of strategic support and guidance, as well as training, required for the HYA, as well as providing a clearer definition of their expected roles and responsibilities

7. Consider suggesting to TCCH a change from “Advisory Board” to “Task Force” for the AB members which may better represent their contributions

For the EU:

1. Review with the new UNDP Head of Office the resources needed for future phases and plan the necessary financial contribution accordingly
2. Agree to fund a perception survey on confidence building in the communities where CH interventions have taken place towards the end of each phase, and include it in future DoAs
3. Continue providing support to future project phases in light of the results in achieving the specific objective and its contribution to the overall objective.

2. Object of Evaluation

2.1. Description of the intervention

The UNPD has hired an independent consultant to undertake the Final Evaluation of the Project: “Support to Cultural Heritage Monuments of great importance (Phase 6)”. The Contribution Agreement for Phase 6 was signed on 17 September 2018 and the implementation period started on 1 May 2018 for 34 months and will be ending on 28 February 2021. The total project budget is Euros 3.000.000 entirely funded by the EU.

The overall (or strategic) objective is to support the reconciliation process and to increase the levels of trust between the two main communities on the island – the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. This overall objective will be achieved through the implementation of confidence building measures as agreed by the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH).

The specific objective is “the preservation of Cypriot cultural heritage monuments of great importance by supporting conservation and/or emergency measures for high importance cultural heritage sites”. The sixth phase of the project aims to continue supporting the efforts of the bi-communal TCCH to contribute to the ongoing peace and confidence building process by bringing communities closer to their shared heritage through conservation and emergency measures projects. This is achieved through the following four expected outputs as described in the Description of the Action (DoA):

1. Designs for conservation works of selected cultural heritage sites;
2. Conservation works for selected cultural heritage sites;
3. Communities engaged in the protection and preservation of Cyprus’ diverse and shared cultural heritage and raise awareness through educational activities
4. Maximise visibility and raise awareness about the work of the TCCH and EU funded related projects.

The results framework under point V of the DoA lists the different indicators that are used to appraise the expected outputs regarding the project performance.

2.2. Context and background

Since 1964 a United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus was established (UNFICYP) in line with the UN Security Council Resolution 186. The country was divided into two parts after the 1974 events. The buffer zone, also known as the green line, spans from the East to the West, dividing the Turkish Cypriot community in the northern part, from the Greek Cypriot community in the southern part. The historical city of Nicosia remains the last divided capital in the world, with the buffer zone also cutting through 16th century Venetian stonewalls.

In 2008, the leadership on both sides agreed to established bi-communal technical committees (TC) that could work on issues of common interest in the island. Chief among the initially eight technical committees was the TC on Cultural Heritage (CH), referred to as TCCH. The TCCH is comprised by ten members (five from each community) headed by two representatives, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot. They are supported by an Advisory Board (AB) which is also composed of an equal number of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriot personnel (from each community), and headed by two coordinators, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot. A majority of both TCCH members and AB members work on voluntary basis and do not receive payment or honorarium from the stakeholders. Currently with the increase in the workload linked to the higher number of sites and monuments, three TCCH project managers have been hired part-time to support the work of the TCCH. As TCCH does not have a legal personality, it cannot be a grant recipient. UNDP is therefore providing an essential role in managing and implementing the actual CH projects that the TCCH has identified as priorities based on their strategy. The structure is complex given the voluntary nature of the TCCH and AB members work, and the lack of a formally recognised body with implementation means. While the TCCH has developed a strategy for all CH in Cyprus and rationale for identifying CH sites, the AB members provide technical information to the TCCH and UNDP supports the work of the TCCH in management and implementation of all the CH project interventions.

TCCH has worked as a very committed body since its creation and has achieved very tangible and observable results through the commitment and dedication of its members, of the AB members as well as the indispensable role of the UNDP. It should be noted that within the wider framework of the TCs, the UN facilitator for the TCCH is also the Head of Civil Affairs at UNFICYP. However, considering the substantial investments made in CH monuments under this project, UNDP has had more direct and frequent exchanges with the TCCH to ensure that the workplans were respected and on other issues regarding the implementation of the various phases of the CH project. The structure and mechanism are a complex one, but they have been working over the previous phases as shown by the number of CH monuments and sites that have been restored or preserved.

Given the political sensitivities regarding the context and the aspects related to legal matters, the project needs to work outside the traditional institutional lines to avoid becoming tangled up in issues over which it has no control. By remaining a non-legal entity, the TCCH has been able to work jointly together in a bi-communal mode for the past ten years, gradually building a very strong relationship amongst its membership from both communities. A number of TCCH members interviewed talked of the TCCH as a “family” to show the good relationships between its members. This has allowed CH monuments to be restored during the previous phases despite at times facing a constraining and complex environment.

2.3. Scale and complexity of the evaluation object

The project's four outputs are clearly defined. The geographical scope is the entire island of Cyprus, based on the priorities decided upon by the TCCH and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The total resources engaged are EUR 3 million over 34 months. The specific objective is the preservation of Cypriot cultural heritage monuments of great importance, while the higher-level objective is to support the reconciliation process and to increase the levels of trust between the two main communities on the island. The Theory of Change (ToC) supporting this project is that when all communities are engaged in the protection and promotion of cultural heritage in support to the peace-building process, this builds trust and confidence, which in turn strengthens the climate for reconciliation and social cohesion.

The key stakeholders involved in the implementation are the TCCH, which has identified the strategy and priority list of sites to be preserved or restored, in line with the project's objective. They are fully involved in all stages of the implementation except for the administrative and financial matters for which UNDP is the responsible party.

AB members are responsible for providing the TCCH with the proper technical guidance to make informed decision making. They are also in close contact with UNDP on technical implementation issues.

Responsibility for implementation of all activities is with UNDP. The entire funding envelope for this project is provided by the European Union.

2.4. Status of implementation of the object

In terms of outputs 1,2, and 4, the project has exceeded the initial DoA targets and has carried out a high number of designs and conservations/restoration works within this phase. A high visibility was given to all project activities and a very good use of social media to communicate these results. However, for output 3 related to community engagement and education activities, the COVID-19 pandemic has seriously affected the results and some of the planned activities had to be re-scheduled (e.g., restoration camps). However, those activities that could take place have done so with considerable success as evidenced in the various visibility materials and reports available. It needs to be underlined that a significant accomplishment was to reach, and even exceed, the quantitative targets for the designs and CH interventions, as the COVID-19 has caused disruption of mobility and the crossings have been closed for three months, thereby requiring added flexibility and responsiveness from all parties involved in the implementation of the works. This speaks to the commitment and engagement of UNDP and Cypriot contractors who were able to continue the works in a very challenging environment.

3. Purpose, scope and objective of the assessment

This final evaluation is meant to provide evidence of results and accountability to the UNDP, the European Union, the TCCH and other stakeholders to draw lessons from the evaluation for future similar undertakings. It is undertaken under the oversight of the UNDP Cyprus. The UNDP evaluation manager is the UNDP Programme and Communications Analyst, in consultation with

the Programme Team. Her role is to ensure that the final evaluation remains on track with its work plan and submits the required deliverables.

The objective of this final evaluation is to provide an assessment of the project performance throughout its implementation period. The criteria for the evaluation are standard evaluation criteria defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG): relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact. The evaluation is also requested to assess the following themes: gender, theory of change, stakeholders and partnership strategy.

The final external evaluation has three purposes:

- 4) To provide a summative evaluation of the performance and results to date,
- 5) To identify good practices and lessons to be carried forward into potential future interventions with similar outcomes
- 6) To provide recommendations, where relevant, on aspects which could be improved

The scope of the final evaluation is the entire implementation period of the Project Phase 6 since its start on 1 May 2018 until 30 November 2020.

This final evaluation is undertaken by UNDP because it is contractually foreseen, at a time when the UNDP Head of Office is leaving her post. Her role was key in connecting the different stakeholders and finding a mechanism through which all parties could work together to implement CH interventions. Thus, it is also important to have this final evaluation as a legacy to the work undertaken to date with the TCCH and with the support of the EU.

The evaluation also formulates recommendations that may be useful for future phases or future interventions in the field of CH. However, the importance of the context is underlined as is the complexity and sensitivity required when working through a non-legal entity (TCCH).

3.1 Main evaluation questions, coverage

The main evaluation questions as identified in the inception report are used to structure the findings section of this report. The evaluation focused on the Phase 6 of the project, but it is also evident that the earlier phases have contributed to the level of readiness, preparedness, collaboration and trust amongst the various actors and that this was a process started much earlier. While not evaluating the previous five phases, it is however clearly recognised that some of the achievements are collectively drawn from the six phases altogether, and may not necessarily result from Phase 6 only.

3.2. Description of the evaluation criteria and performance standards

As requested in the TOR, the evaluation follows the “PME Handbook” established by the UNDP in 2009 and updated in 2011, which are compatible with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and standards (revised 2017), and the revised 2019 IEO UNDP evaluation policy and IEO evaluation guidelines of January 2019, and the undg RBM guidance (2012). The final evaluation also adheres to the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation and code of conduct (2008). The approach follows also a “utilization-focused evaluation” approach that is

described by M. Q. Patton in his book “utilization-focused evaluation ” that continues to be a good practice reference material for the conduct of evaluations¹.

The five criteria for undertaking the assessment are mentioned in the ToR and are the standard criteria used for project evaluations: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

The definition of each of the evaluation criteria has been given by the OECD/DAC glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management updated in 2019² as follows :

“Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results

Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed.”

In addition, and to the extent possible, the evaluation will also assess the gender responsiveness of the project, review its theory of change and its stakeholders and partnership strategy.

Note: technically, impact is evaluated, as defined above, over the long-term. In the case of the project, the evaluator focused on direct and indirect effects, e.g., contribution to the outcome (or change process) triggered by the outputs completed under the project, as there can be no rigorous impact assessment at this stage and within the parameters of the project log frame for phase 6 which is limited to less than three years. Prospective evaluation based on appreciative inquiry was applied during interviews to identify linkages between results and higher-level project results (e.g., specific and overall objectives) as well as an adaptation of the Most Significant Change (MSC) to gather the perception of what appeared to be the key achievement for each Key Informant interviewed.

4. Evaluation methodology

4.1. Tools and methodology

The evaluation used a combination of methods:

¹ M.Q. Patton, “Utilization-focused Evaluation”, Sage Publications, 3rd Edition, 1998, also see the link https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/utilization_focused_evaluation

² Better Criteria for Better Evaluation, Revised Evaluation Criteria, Definitions and Principles for Use, OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2019 which completes and updates the traditional OECD/DAC, glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management, Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness series, 2002

- d) Documentary review of project outputs and reports submitted by the UNDP and used to prepare the inception report;
- e) 23 Individual Key Informant Interviews (KII) with: TCCH members (11), AB coordinators (2), the EU (2), UNDP (6), and UN bodies (2). The total interview time was 1,500 minutes or 25 hours, yielding an average of 65 minutes per interview. A total of 11 women and 12 men were interviewed.
- f) 2 Focus group Discussions (FGD) with the Youth Ambassadors (YA) into two gender-disaggregated groups: 2 men (55 min.) and 7 women (80 min.)
- g) Triangulation (e.g., confirmation by different sources) was used to ensure the validity of the findings (between documentation, reports, KII, links and visibility materials, etc.)

Given the methodology, the evaluation was mostly qualitative and worked from the perspective of the Most Significant Change (MSC) approach, in order to obtain feedback from the key informants.

All KII were undertaken using a questionnaire protocol to ensure consistency and comparability of the answers. The semi-structured interview also contained a five-point rating scale to obtain a quantified perception of the KII's qualitative appraisal.

The sample of respondents for this evaluation was discussed with the UNDP. Given the fact that it is not a "traditional" project implemented through institutions and mindful of the sensitivities involved in the exercise, the sample of respondents was defined to be all TCCH members, the AB coordinators, the EU, UNDP staff and two other respondents from United Nations that provided some feedback on the project's higher-level goal of confidence building and information on the establishment and functioning of the Technical Committees created in 2008.

4.2. Limitation regarding data collection

Given COVID-related restrictions the evaluation could not take place in Cyprus. No observational data could thus be gathered. All KII were undertaken using remote means such as Skype, MS Teams, WhatsApp, Zoom, etc.

In one case an interpreter had to be used which UNDP provided effectively.

All of the designated key informants identified in the inception phase except one were interviewed (one person who was in the hospital).

All results framework (RF) indicators as established in the DoA were readily available from the UNDP reports.

5. Findings

The findings are structured along the evaluation criteria and the key evaluation questions (mentioned hereunder) in order to facilitate the reading flow and in line with the UNEG Quality Report Evaluation checklist³.

³ UNEG, Quality checklist for evaluation reports, 2010, available at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607>

5.1. Relevance

5.1.1. Does the project remain currently relevant?

The project has been relevant from the beginning and remains highly relevant in the current context on account of both its general objective and its strategic objective. Immovable cultural heritage is extremely rich and varied in Cyprus and a new priority list of 86 monuments was approved by the leaders of the two communities in 2016 and updated in 2018 with the addition of another site. Interest for CH monuments among the Cypriot population is high, as shown in the UNDP commissioned perception survey amongst communities undertaken in February 2017 under phase 4 of the CH project. Among TCCH members, their commitment and dedication to their work despite the voluntary nature of their engagement is a proof of their interest and respect for CH. The same is true of the technical members which form the Advisory Board. All Cypriot stakeholders are therefore supportive of the tangible results achieved through CH preservation and restoration.

In relation to the higher-level objective of confidence building and trust, the project remains entirely relevant at present. The bi-communal nature and long-lasting relationship among TCCH members, some of whom have described their relations as “a family”, shows that trust has clearly been created amongst the primary stakeholder group. The bi-communal interventions in support of CH are clear evidence of results, which would not have been possible without the necessary trust to find negotiated solutions to complex and sensitive situations, with a coverage of physical works spread across the entire island. The above-mentioned perception survey also refers to the fact that, for an overwhelming majority of Cypriots respondents from both communities, the preservation of CH is seen as contributing to confidence building amongst the different communities.

The European Union (EU) has been funding CH interventions since 2010. It is the sixth phase of the project that is funded, and therefore it remains clearly aligned to the donor’s priorities and interests. Looking at the wider dimension of the sensitive situation in Cyprus, it is also recognised by external actors that the TCCH is, from the currently 12 existing TCs created, amongst the best performing and more active TC. Comparatively the subject matter (CH) may be less controversial than other themes, but the dynamics created amongst its members, with a strong and committed bi-communal leadership from Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot representatives of the TCCH that has been awarded the European Citizen’s Prize by the European Parliament in 2015, have been proven to provide the enabling conditions to meet the project’s specific and overall objectives.

For UNDP, this project fits into the strategic corporate frameworks in which their interventions in Cyprus contribute to the global mandate on conflict prevention with an emphasis on governance and peacebuilding (Sustainable Development Goal -SDG- 16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) and sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11).

Among the primary project stakeholders, all of the Key Informants interviewed stated the continued project relevance.

5.1.2. What are the key issues and gaps tackled by the project?

This project articulates a mechanism (TCCH) which has been designed to fulfil its mandate:

- To promote respect and appreciation of the rich and varied cultural heritage of Cyprus
- To undertake actions aiming to protect, preserve and when possible rehabilitate cultural monuments of this heritage for future generations;
- To pursue its mandate as an integral part of the ongoing process of promoting greater understanding and improving relations between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots;
- To endeavour through its work to highlight and promote the significance and value of the rich and plural cultural heritage of the island as a potential agent for active cooperation, mutual understanding and collaboration.

Evidence shows that these gaps have clearly been addressed through the work of the TCCH and the support provided by UNDP as responsible for the project implementation. The TCCH has been cited as a model and good practice example for other technical committees by some evaluation respondents.

It is the view of the evaluation that the dual mandate of CH preservation and awareness raising, and improvement of community relationships through confidence-building measures related to the preservation of CH, remains necessary over the medium term until a longer-term solution can be achieved. Although the TCCH was not designed as a perennial body, it remains necessary in the current context in order to continue to inform the strategy and the priorities of the CH preservation, through a collaborative bi-communal shared understanding regarding the vision and objectives of the interventions. Having achieved this common vision has been a gradual process which is now proving to be a key enabling factor of success.

5.2. Efficiency

5.2.1. Is the project bringing value for money?

Despite a constraining environment and very challenging operating conditions linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, the legal and contractual imperatives of working on both sides of the island with bi-communal teams, the project has shown high efficiency and responsiveness capacity to meet the deadlines and workplan objectives.

All of the planned physical outputs as stated in the DoA related to CH have been achieved, or quantitative targets exceeded (for designs and conservation/restoration works). From the four project outputs, only certain components of the output 3, related to community engagement and education, had to be reviewed and adjusted given the C-19 mobility restrictions.

If the project is appraised from the perspective of the return on the investment, defined as the contribution to both the specific objective (CH preservation and awareness raising) and overall objective (confidence building and trust across communities) the project is certainly showing a good return on the investment. There are very few functioning TCs that can present a similar track record and the TCCH seems to have been a pioneer in terms of bi-communal collaboration and trust building. Because the TCCH has not legal existence, project implementation rests with UNDP. UNDP has shown to have a small team of professionals in Cyprus. As the number and complexity of the projects increased in phase 6 in relation to previous phases, and in line with the TCCH's strategy to focus more on community-engagement and smaller projects to provide

a larger coverage, project implementation is becoming more management intensive. It is particularly important to ensure that the necessary resources will be available to UNDP to continue facilitating efficient project management over the future phases or similar interventions.

5.2.2. Has the project been efficiently managed?

Financial management appears to be sound and the project delivery is on track with a delivery rate of 81% as of 31st October 2020 according to UNDP financial statements (combined 2.4 M€ expenditures/committed out of a total budget of 3.0 M€). The internal UNDP resources for this phase were a bit stretched given the complexity of the interventions, that included design, conservation works and emergency priority projects to safeguard sites in immediate structural danger, and developed the new components under output 3 community engagement and education. All of the UNDP team had to work hard to address the multiple constraints and delays to achieve the expected objectives. The C-19 pandemic further complicated and slowed things and required a lot of problem solving and responsiveness from UNDP's project management. The details of the numerous difficulties encountered and solved are listed in the Interim Narrative Report covering the period of 1 May 2018 to 7 June 2020 for each site and monument. This shows a superior problem-solving capacity from UNDP which rests in part on the good working relationship with the donor and the TCCH.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) which comprises the donor, the TCCH and UNDP to ensure oversight and decision-making regarding project implement, was shown to have very good working relationship and this allowed a good, shared understanding of the project situation and a positive, constructive and flexible response to address the emerging problems and needs.

5.2.3. How well was the project designed, and how strong is the project logic and theory of change?

The template used for the project design is based on the EU format of the "Description of the Action" or DoA, which has been used for phase 6 of the project. It is not entirely aligned on corporate UNDG Results-Based Management Principles, but it is sufficient to identify the direct project objective (or specific objective) and the overall objective (or strategic objective). The DoA also contains a very schematic Theory of Change (ToC) which could be further developed. UNDP has provided additional information such as the UNDP Programme Management Office Cyprus Results and Resources Framework 2018-2021 to better understand how this project was supporting UNDP's positioning in Cyprus.

The output level results have been clearly identified and quantified, but the project falls short of identifying or describing what is meant by "confidence building measures". The evaluation found that there is an agreement among key informants that more could be done to inform on this intangible result. While outputs are largely tangible and quantifiable with observable evidence linked to CH works and visibility materials produced, the degree to which confidence and trust are being built are a question of perception.

Without a doubt confidence and trust have been built within the bi-communal TCCH (without which there would be no project to implement) and between the donor, TCCH and UNDP. However, to appraise the effects of the project on the communities, it is necessary to undertake a perception survey. At the request of the evaluator, UNDP shared two such perception surveys:

one was undertaken under phase 4 of this project in February 2017 in ten sites where CH interventions had been completed, with a sample of 165 bi-communal respondents⁴ and another specifically in Famagusta in March 2018 with 153 respondents (of which 41% women)⁵.

The latter mentions that “The reasons for agreeing with the suggestion that the restoration of monuments could help the peacebuilding process expressed in this year’s survey were very similar to of the rural survey of 2016. They were largely related to the expectation that restorations would attract visitors from the other community and encourage interaction between the two – interaction and the resulting understanding of each other being considered a first step towards reconciliation”.⁶ However, this most recent survey also indicated interesting results regarding the perception in regards to confidence building: “Agreement with the suggestion that restoration of monuments associated with cultural heritage was capable of contributing to the peace-building process in Cyprus was relatively weak during this year’s survey, with 43% of the sample agreeing ‘totally’ or ‘somewhat’ with it, compared to the survey carried out in rural areas in 2016, when the vast majority (71%) had agreed with it to some extent.”⁷

Evaluation respondents all agreed that perception surveys can be useful to bring evidence of intangible effects and that a perception survey should be built into the DoA for each phase to be able to appraise in time the public’s perception of CH works and its effect on confidence-building. To this end the evaluation recommends a more targeted perception survey to be included in all future phases to indicate a contribution to confidence-building, while also taking good care to define what those “confidence building measures” are so there is no misinterpretation of the term.

At the output level, the Results Framework included in the DoA is sufficient to bring evidence of results, being mindful that for higher level results this will be provided by a perception survey which should be carried out towards the end of each project phase.

5.2.4. Did the project have a risk management strategy?

The project included a risk analysis (DoA p. 27), but the most effective risk management strategy consisted in the regular PSC meetings that allowed the primary stakeholders to reach a decision and a consensus on difficulties and problems encountered and allowed the project to reach its expected objectives. Considering the nature of the project and the fact that this is not a typical UNDP project where UNDP is working through institutions, the support and good communications and coordination amongst the PSC members has been the most effective risk management strategy. Much of this is also due to individual member’s skills and capacities to identify a constructive solution.

5.3. Effectiveness

⁴ UNDP, Report on A Survey of Local Populations’ Awareness and Attitudes Towards UNDP and Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage Projects, February 2017, p. 6

⁵ A.E. Qualitative, Report on a Survey on Awareness and Attitudes towards UNDP and Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage Projects in Famagusta, UNDP, March 2018, p. 5

⁶ Ibid., p. 7-8

⁷ Ibid., p. 8

5.3.1. What are the key results of the project?

The TCCH is a powerful and key mechanism to set the vision and the strategy for CH preservation in Cyprus through bi-communal membership that works on consensus basis. This has allowed the implementation of a large number of projects since the EU provided its funding in 2010, and a high number of CH sites and monuments have been preserved, restored or have received emergency repair works. According to information received from UNDP, no less than 67 significant CH sites in Cyprus have been preserved or restored over the past ten years through the combined action of the TCCH and the UNDP and 81 designs have been completed.

The intrinsic value of CH as a connector between diverse communities has been recognised and espoused by the members of the TCCH, the UNDP and the AB. The dynamics created, working across the communities as a “family” and a high level of trust and respect for each other means that the TCCH has been able to overcome the different barriers and constraints and has achieved significant results. The visible and tangible results are the CH monuments and sites that have been preserved and restored over the last ten years, and more particularly, for phase 6 of the project:

11 project designs (versus a target of 6) (under output 1), 9 versus a target of 4 conservation projects completed (output 2), 4 educational events (of a target of 4), 3 community events (of a target of 6, because of C-19 limitations, but a series of videos were produced and are expected to be published shortly in order to keep the communities engaged using digital tools so as to circumvent the restrictions), 3 ad hoc seminars (of a target of 3) were undertaken and achieved (under output 3). Given the limitations and constraints related to the reduced mobility linked to the COVID pandemic, the restoration camp could not be held (output 3.3) and an additional 3 community engagements were planned to be held virtually to meet the target under output 3.2. Under the output 4 related to visibility, no less than 134 press clippings were done, with two links to specific ceremonies (target: one press release per project at least), 291 social media posts published (target 2 updates per month, output 4.2.), 2 videoclips disseminated on social media (from a target of 4), 8 awareness raising events organised with 143 people (versus a target of 4 events under output 4.4), and the establishment of a functional TCCH website (output 4.6), which has been done although more materials and information need to be included. The Knowledge Exchange Conference under output 4.5 was planned for February 2020 but had to be postponed due to the C-19 pandemic.

From a quantitative perspective, the project in phase 6 has largely surpassed the output targets across the range of outputs, except for those where the physical restrictions linked to C-19 have obliged to postpone or cancel activities that required a physical presence. However, the high number of results under the direct CH interventions under outputs 1 and 2 need to be recognised as a very good result considering the conditions under which projects were implemented since February 2020.

Beyond the quantitative elements, the project was able to achieve a high qualitative level of appreciation from the various stakeholders interviewed. All informants considered the results as good or very good, and several examples were given to show the emotional state of Cypriots from various communities at project ceremonies. That is not to say that everything was perfect during project implementation: a number of difficulties and problems inevitably arise. What counts is the capacity of the TCCH, AB and the UNDP to find a consensus and promote a constructive solution.

The role of UNDP has to be mentioned as a critical element of success as well. Not only is UNDP's capacity to manage and implement the project a *sine qua non* condition for the achievement of the project's objectives, but beyond this capacity, TCCH and AB members recognised the value of UNDP's constructive attitude and commitment to finding solutions and problem solving, something that requires diplomatic and negotiation skills given the exogenous constraints that affect project implementation. A trusting relationship has been established between TCCH, AB and UNDP which allows for constructive solutions to emerging problems.

Another key result which is a new component under phase 6 is the launching of the Heritage Youth Ambassadors (HYA) initiative. All respondents have viewed this initiative very positively and it is potentially highly valuable. However, with the C-19 restrictions, the suspension of the trip to Brussels, and other limitations, some of the initial positive dynamics around the involvement of the youth seem to have been lost (based on two FGD with male and female youth during the evaluation). There seems to be some unmet expectations from the HYA in terms of coordination, support and oversight, which the TCCH and UNDP need to discuss. While HYA act as the "youth voice" of the TCCH, there is a need for a closer interaction and coordination between the HYA and the TCCH. Considering that the majority of TCCH members are volunteers, and that support to the HYA represents an additional commitment, UNDP and TCCH should discuss the manner in which the programme will evolve in the future. The evaluator's analysis is that the initiative holds great potential, but as was done for the TCCH members, a common vision and shared understanding of CH should be developed amongst the 40 HYA. Hence, it is the view of this evaluation that the HYA should receive special preparation and tools to undertake their work and maybe also more clearly define expectations for HYA and provide them with strategic guidance. But this will require added dedication from TCCH, and it may need to discuss with UNDP whether it has the necessary capacities to undertake the task. The TCCH website has been launched and also contains information on the HYA initiative, but it needs to be fed and more information needs to be made available.

5.3.2. To what extent is the specific objective achieved?

Considering that the specific objective is the "preservation of Cypriot CH monuments of great importance", the project has achieved its specific objective fully, and exceeded its quantitative targets as previously mentioned.

The most serious challenge is now to find an acceptable solution regarding the use-and-maintenance of CH sites in Cyprus. While a report has been commissioned by the UNDP and TCCH on Preventive Conservation and Maintenance, in October 2020, there is a consensus in the TCCH that a solution needs to be found to ensure proper maintenance of the CH monuments. However, the solution is not simply technical as it also implies the concept of use with that of maintenance. Community engagement in maintenance is certainly recommended and supported by the TCCH, but the actual manner in which this is to be done remains the subject of discussion. As is often said, the devil is in the details, and an agreement on the implementation modalities of the use-and-maintenance approach to be used in the future for CH monuments is not yet reached. TCCH members interviewed also referred to a previous TCCH specific report analysing the issue of maintenance from a socio-economic perspective. All stakeholders are clearly aware and concerned about the need to agree on a sound preventive maintenance scheme, but this seems to be as of yet undefined and may be the single most important task to be addressed in the near future. It is noted that some of the emergency works

had to be undertaken to CH sites which had been previously restored but for which maintenance could not be ensured.

5.3.3. To what extent is the overall project objective achieved?

The project is achieving, as it is on an on-going process, the overall objective of confidence building across the communities, but it is not equipped to provide evidence to this effect given the project's results framework structure. As there is no specific indication of how confidence building measures will be appraised, UNDP needs to build into each phase and DoA a specific tool to gather evidence of results at that specific level. Previously mentioned surveys commissioned by UNDP provide an entry point, although they should be tweaked to incorporate more questions and probing on the confidence building effects of CH sites, and include use-and-maintenance questions to the extent possible. It would be highly desirable for all stakeholders that each phase carries out a perception survey in the communities where the CH interventions have been undertaken. This will allow to look over the longer term at the changes towards reaching the overall objective.

Confidence building measures have to be more clearly defined in order to be used as countable evidence of results achieved which support the overall project goal. It is important for donors to include a financial provision to carry out one survey per phase to develop the evidence base regarding the achievement of the overall project objective. This is due to the fact that the DoA does not specify which are the confidence building measures (CBM) that are being monitored. Giving a voice to the communities to obtain their own feedback and understanding on what constitutes CBM is a highly valuable exercise and provides evidence of results towards the overall objective through the different project phases.

If the TCCH bi-communal relationship is any indication of what can potentially be accomplished through the preservation of CH in Cyprus in confidence building across the communities, it should be certainly noted that the approach appears to be bearing fruit, considering all the achievements of the TCCH over the past ten years (and thus over the various phases of the project).

5.3.4. What are examples of good practice?

The evaluation noted the availability and willingness of all TCCH members to be interviewed for this evaluation. Without the inputs from TCCH members and AB coordinators this report would not have been possible.

A recognised good practice example for Cyprus is how the TCCH has been able to operate and obtain concrete and tangible results in the entire island. It has developed a consensual approach to decision making, which has allowed 67 CH monuments to be preserved, all this through commitment and dedication of TCCH members.

Another example of good practice is the good level of communication and coordination between the EU, the UNDP and the TCCH which has shown to solve many problems during the PSC meetings and is based on mutual trust and respect.

The extensive use of social media to provide visibility to the project is a further example of good practice. Anecdotal evidence from TCCH members (who share a WhatsApp group) shows that some also post information related to CH, as do the HYA, and the UNDP. So, there is a very high

level of visibility provided both through social media and regular press and media (including videos). The corresponding links are provided in UNDP's narrative reports.

The project and the TCCH mechanism are very unusual for UNDP, that normally works through institutional support. In this case, the sensitivity, respect and understanding of the constraints have also been a proof of good practice, which merits the continued support of the EU beyond the phase 6 of the project.

On the operational front, it is worth mentioning that UNDP has now moved to an e-tendering process, which enhances the timeliness and efficiency of the tenders.

An interesting, good practice as reported by some of the TCCH members is that now that the work of the TCCH is more visible and recognised, they are approached (sometimes via social media) by the communities themselves to request specific CH interventions. This is not only a good practice which shows the respect and support for the work of the TCCH but also good practice as these communities are more likely to be engaged in supporting the use-and-maintenance scheme for CH if they are already expressing their interest in the preservation of their CH sites and monuments.

As a lesson learnt, during phase 6 of the project the issue of accessibility to the sites was raised for those intervention sites which are near military areas. Two such interventions faced access restrictions in the buffer zone given the proximity to military areas and in one case it took two years to have the restrictions lifted. Good practice is to try to avoid as much as possible working on sites/monuments near military areas to avoid unforeseen complications and implementation delays.

5.3.5. What capacities have been developed as a result of the project?

Firstly, the TCCH has learned to work with UNDP as a key partner to implement the project. UNDP has also been able to develop its capacities in managing a complex project that is not aligned to its traditional institutionally anchored support.

Secondly, there is some anecdotal evidence that the limited number of contractors who work on CH have benefitted from some technical capacity development from the UNDP's technical team, and that this has partly enhanced the number of contractors in the island. This appears to be more the case on one side of the island than on the other. Regardless, the evaluation also found some capacity development of contractors working on CH, but it is not able to appraise to what extent this has been critical to the successful implementation of the projects.

Thirdly, the awareness raising activities under the output 3 have also contributed to increasing the level of knowledge of communities, which is further enhanced through the communication materials produced under output 4. The anecdote about communities being more aware of the work of the TCCH and coming to request CH interventions in their community is evidence of this higher level of awareness and understanding about the value of Cyprus' common CH.

5.3.6. How effective was the partnership strategy?

The partnership strategy amongst the PSC members (EU, UNDP, TCCH) is very constructive and dynamic. A trusting relationship is established which allows for flexibility and problem solving. All partners are committed to the realization of the project's objectives.

The voluntary mechanisms of TCCH and AB are critical to the project success. TCCH is the engine that drives the process and UNDP is the body that makes projects a reality.

One aspect where the partnership strategy could be improved is related to the engagement of the HYA, where more strategic guidance, support and coordination with the TCCH is strongly recommended.

Another partnership which could be further pursued is with academia, students and NGOs working on CH in Cyprus, with closer links that could provide more synergies with the project (e.g., educational site visits, awareness raising, technical restoration/conservation aspects, etc.) and enhance mutual learning.

5.4. Outcome and effects (instead of impact)

5.4.1. What is the most significant change brought about by the project?

For TCCH members it is clearly the preservation and restoration of 67 CH sites and monuments. This project sends a powerful message to the communities that CH is actually able to create connections amongst the communities and provide a win/win situation for all parties involved. As mentioned previously, the fact that TCCH members indicated that community members are now requesting TCCH intervention in CH sites in various communities is an unequivocal sign that the project is contributing to higher visibility, awareness and interest in CH, which in turn provides opportunities for bi-communal engagement and exchanges.

Another effect of the project (not related to phase 6 only) is the trusting relationship between TCCH members. Evidence was provided where pressures from specific interest groups were exerted regarding the manner in which CH monuments were preserved/restored. TCCH members from the same community as the pressure groups had to intervene to push (and reach) an agreement that could allow the CH works to be undertaken in line with the strategy followed by the TCCH for the conservation and preservation of CH sites, rather than yielding to criteria which were not aligned with the objective of conservation works. This is an important asset because it allows the non-political bi-communal body to engage with higher level actors from a technical perspective in order to reach an agreement over the manner in which the CH works are actually carried out. Of course, there are always various sensitivities but without this mutually supportive attitude from members of the bi-communal TCCH the project would not have been able to reach its objectives.

Another aspect that is important although it is not technically covered under the DoA for phase 6 is the capacity of the TCCH to obtain funding from different sources including local sources for CH works. This is also a positive outcome that demonstrates the achievements so far have been sufficiently positive to warrant additional funding from other concerned actors on issues of CH in addition to the EU. This is a very good outcome, and it is hoped that it will continue during future phases.

5.4.2. Is there any evidence that the project contributes to confidence building?

For the TCCH the trust and confidence between its bi-communal members is a prerequisite to any tangible result. Without this confidence there would have been no strategy, no criteria or priority list, nor indeed any concrete achievements for the project.

Among the various project partners, the phase 6 has included a number of additional and new components which were not present in previous phases. The higher level of complexity and intensity of phase 6 could not have been possible without the confidence from all partners regarding UNDP's capacity to assume such a management intensive project, notwithstanding the additional challenge of working under C-19 restrictions.

At the higher level and as described under point 5.3.3, there is evidence amongst the communities that the project is contributing to confidence building. However, much of the evidence is anecdotal. Videos, social media posts and articles indicate a strong emotional response from the population, as did some interviews from the various stakeholders. A review of these leaves no doubt that preservation and conservation of CH sites is an important asset to provide a bridge across the communities. Clearly this is also depending on the community and the community's own cultural identity and interests. The two perception surveys commissioned by the UNDP/TCCH in February 2017 in ten communities on both sides of the island and in March 2018 in Famagusta also indicate that CH is able to play the role of connector across the communities.

However, the project has not developed a tool to systematically report and provide evidence on the higher-level objective of confidence building. It is therefore the view of the evaluation which was supported by almost all of the evaluation respondents that a systematic perception survey should be undertaken at the end of each phase in the communities where the CH interventions have taken place to provide evidence of the changes in line with the overall objective of confidence building.

Results seem to be there, but they are not captured adequately nor reported on. Future phases should review the M&E aspect and assure a tailor-made survey is undertaken to provide the evidence of confidence building.

5.4.3. To what extent are the stakeholders committed to the project and own it?

The stakeholders are all fully committed and supportive of the project. TCCH members are the champions of CH and many have been there for years, despite the voluntary character of their posts (not supported or remunerated). All are fully committed although naturally not all are able to devote as much time to TCCH matters depending on their other activities and responsibilities.

UNDP is fully committed and indeed a founding cornerstone of the project. With a Head of Office fully engaged in constructive programme management and solution finding over the past ten years with high diplomatic and negotiations skills, supported by a small team of committed professionals, the UNDP Programme Office has found its strategic place and role in support of the TCCH and the project's objectives, and is also a key committed actor.

Another example of commitment stems from the EU, which has been supporting the project for ten years now over various phases. As indicated during the evaluation interviews, there has been increasing flexibility and commitment in line with the positive results the project has obtained.

The main question is how the project ownership will evolve over the longer-term, as the TCCH was not created as perennial structure and it is now in its 12th year. Some of the members may have to step down for a variety of reasons including age considerations, but it is hoped that the other committed members of the TCCH will be able to ensure a replacement when a TCCH member resigns or when the TCCH representatives step down from their posts.

The evaluation needs to recognise the essential commitment and dedication of three individuals in the results achieved: the two TCCH representatives, whose dedication was recognised by the European Parliament with the European Citizen’s Price Award in 2015. Another individual has been the UNDP Head of Office who was instrumental in the architecture for the mechanism and the ability of the project to achieve concrete results despite the existing difficulties.

5.4.4. Has the project informed policy decision making?

The project’s architecture is not an institutionally based support like most of the UNDP projects. This is due to the complex and sensitive environment in Cyprus. As the TCCH is a non-legal entity, UNDP has to thread uncharted waters to achieve concrete results. Policy decision making is not an objective of the project. However, at some point in time in the future, once the TCCH has been able to find a mechanism for the use-and-maintenance issue of CH sites, it may constitute an example that has the potential to inform policy making.

5.5. Sustainability

5.5.1. How much of the project outputs can continue beyond the period of implementation?

The key challenge to sustainability is finding a solution for the use-and-maintenance of CH sites and monuments. The investment in preserving and restoring CH monuments is lost if the sites cannot be properly maintained. In some cases, it is directly linked to the use of the sites. Therefore, sustainability is dependent on the capacity of the TCCH to agree to a use-and-maintenance system that can be applied across the island to protect the CH sites over the longer-term.

As the other outputs are dependent on the preservation and conservation of CH sites and monuments, it follows that their sustainability will be linked to the solution found for the use-and-maintenance implementation modality of CH monuments and sites.

5.5.2. What are the project’s sustainable achievements?

The dynamics created amongst TCCH members are critical to the continuation of the work and for achieving results. The “family” relationship between TCCH members should be maintained. In that sense, the need to return to presential meetings when the C-19 pandemic will allow it is strongly encouraged, given that virtual meetings do not allow to generate the same group dynamics, and this was also pointed out during the KII by some evaluation respondents.

The TCCH itself is sustainable as long as dedicated, committed and constructive members are able to continue its work. While it is not the object of this evaluation to appraise the TCCH’s capacity, some thought should nonetheless be given regarding the resources needed by the TCCH to assume an ever-expanding role in CH preservation and conservation, in addition to its strategic links and support to the HYA initiative.

The TCCH’s capacity to leverage local funds for CH is also a good indication of sustainability.

The long-term support provided by the EU over the past ten years has been key to promoting an evolution towards sustainability even though it is not yet possible to consider a hand-over and the current structure with the TCCH in the lead strategic role and UNDP as responsible for project implementation needs to be continued over the coming years, subject to major changes in the operating context.

5.5.3. Are there any needs for replication or scaling-up of the project?

The needs are certainly there: the DoA mentions 86 priority sites identified by both leaderships, while 67 CH sites have been completed to date. There remains therefore a number of other sites and priority CH monuments that require preservation/conservation works. There is a case to be made for a larger project envelope in view of the outstanding needs, and in support to the higher-level objective, particularly when the context is challenging. TCCH is one of a kind technical committee and is assuming important responsibilities. UNDP's Programme Management Office (PMO) is also a small office that has limited resources and is facing an increase in the number of projects implemented and the complexity of their execution. As a result, it would be very positive if a larger project could be undertaken with expanded funding. However, a careful analysis of the resources in UNDP and also within the TCCH should be made to ensure that the volume of work does not jeopardise the management capacity required to implement the projects and obtain the expected results.

5.6. Cross cutting themes

5.6.1. To what extent was the project gender responsive?

The project was not designed as a gender responsive intervention. As mentioned, this is not a typical UNDP project. The composition of the TCCH is decided by the two leaders, and it is not a UNDP responsibility. That said, the gender composition of TCCH is strongly male dominated. It is difficult for the project design to be gender responsive when part of the design is not within the remit of UNDP. UNDP will continue to suggest to its partners to be more gender responsive.

5.6.2. Was a gender focus applied during project implementation?

In terms of project intervention, UNDP has tried to incorporate the gender dimension to the extent possible. UNDP is aware that it needs to do more in the future to address gender sensitivity. Nevertheless, there has been some attempts to incorporate gender, such as in the parity in the composition of HYA (20 female and 20 male youth), in recommending that the technical teams from the contractors include female participation, and in the perception surveys that were undertaken and contain gender-disaggregated results. It is noted that the UNDP Programme team seems to be an all-female team, something that is sending a positive signal from UNDP to its partners. During FGD with female HYA, it was mentioned that gender was not a main impediment for working on CH issues, but it was also recognised that the senior managers were still usually men.

6. Conclusions

The project phase 6 has achieved very positive results despite a sensitive and complex environment, compounded by the C-19 pandemic in February 2020. The quantitative results have largely been exceeded with counted activities which had to be rescheduled or suspended because of the C-19. The qualitative results are deemed to be generally good or very good by key informants, and some of the challenges and technical disagreements were able to be solved through the constructive attitude and cooperation of all parties involved in the project, particularly the TCCH. CH monuments and sites restored under the project are creating a higher level of interest from communities who see how CH preservation is a positive asset.

There has been a strong common engagement of all parties involved (TCCH, AB, UNDP, EU) even though most of the TCCH and AB members are volunteers. The trusting relationship between all actors has allowed for flexibility and solution-oriented decision making. The strength of CH as a connector across the communities despite a sensitive political environment has been shown. Future phases still require a careful balancing act and the identification of a solution on the use-and-maintenance question regarding CH sites and monuments. It is absolutely essential to maintain the TCCH and AB as non-legal entities in order to operate in Cyprus' complex environment.

UNDP has done its job well, creatively and diplomatically, and is recognised as a clear added value by all evaluation respondents. TCCH representatives stressed that without UNDP's commitment and attitude the TCCH could not possibly have achieved its results. The replacement of the long posting as Head of Office in UNDP is a challenge and a source of concern for project partners. It is essential that her replacement maintains the strategic vision, communication and diplomatic skills, engagement to problem solving, in addition to management capacities to ensure the process remains on track for future phases.

It is absolutely indispensable to be able to think outside the box and work with informal bodies comprised of senior volunteer staff in a constructive manner outside the institutional frameworks. It requires a special character to navigate in a project that has few limits and virtually no written rules of engagement and roles and responsibilities and that operates across various divided communities in the entire island. The decision regarding the choice for the new UNDP Head of Office should therefore be mindful these aspects.

7. Recommendations

For UNDP:

1. UNDP's replacement as Head of Office should have similar skills and diplomatic capacity as the incumbent. A presential hand-over would be preferred
2. Review with the EU the necessary level of resources required for UNDP in light of higher volume of projects and increase complexity of the interventions.
3. Consider discussing with the TCCH priority interventions for the next phase based on communities that accept use-and-maintenance solutions approach (which remains to be defined) with a 3-year maintenance fund built into the project intervention
4. Commission targeted and specifically tailored perception surveys as the end of each phase to obtain evidence of the results on confidence building and a long-term vision of the impact of the project through its different phases
5. Take a more strategic approach to communications to contribute to higher level results

6. Discuss with the TCCH the type of strategic support and guidance, as well as training, required for the HYA, as well as providing a clearer definition of their expected roles and responsibilities
7. Consider suggesting to TCCH a change from “Advisory Board” to “Task Force” for the AB members which may better represent their contributions

Although it is not the mandate of the evaluation to evaluate the TCCH, some recommendations are made hereunder which could be discussed with the UN facilitator for the TCCH at the UNFICYP:

1. Ensure a wider dissemination of project information and materials, as not all respondents showed to have similar knowledge of the project implementation, product and constraints
2. Review the resources needed, particularly in terms of project management capacity within the TCCH, to carry out subsequent phases of the project and provide the support to the HYA

For the EU:

1. Review with the new UNDP Head of Office the resources needed for future phases and plan the necessary financial contribution accordingly
2. Agree to fund a perception survey on confidence building in the communities where CH interventions have taken place towards the end of each phase, and include it in the DoA
3. Continue providing support to future project phases in light of the results in achieving the specific objective and its contribution to the overall objective.