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| **I. Position Information** | | | | |
| Job Title:  Location:  Supervisor:  Type of Contract:  Contract duration: | | | Evaluation Expert – Mid-term project evaluation of “Local Infrastructure Facility” project  Nicosia, Cyprus (2 weeks) and home based (4 weeks)  Programme and Communications Analyst  Individual Contract  2 months | |
| **II. Background** | | | | |
| Cyprus joined the EU in 2004 as a de-facto divided island. On 26 April 2004 the Council of the European Union stated its determination to "put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community and to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community". Against this background, the Commission implements an aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot community based on the Aid Regulation (EC No. 389/2006). The programme is managed by the Commission's Structural Reform Support Service. The programme aims to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.  Based on a long-standing partnership and UNDP previous experience in implementing large and medium-size EU funded urban upgrading and infrastructure projects in the northern part of Cyprus, the European Commission requested UNDP to continue supporting this type of infrastructure projects through the establishment of a new instrument called “Local Infrastructure Facility”.  The Facility will help identify, screen, mature, prepare for tender, and implement local infrastructure investments, targeting the funding on competitive basis to ensure best value for money and providing support also to those communities with a lower technical and administrative capacity. This will in turn result in a greater positive impact on the standard of living of local populations and increase the visibility of EU interventions in the priority areas.  So far the priority areas targeted by the project are:   * Water and wastewater; * Solid waste management; * Energy efficiency; * Environment/Landscaping; and * Social infrastructure   **The overall objective of the project** is to provide technical assistance for the design and implementation of projects aiming at improving environmental, social and economic infrastructure in the Turkish Cypriot community.  **The specific objective** of the project is the establishment of a new mechanism, namely a “Local Infrastructure Facility” (LIF) to coordinate and support the implementation of EU funded infrastructure projects in the northern part of Cyprus. Its main aim is the identification, selection, bringing to maturation, tendering and implementation of sustainable projects selected through iterative participatory processes involving the EU, UNDP and the local communities/beneficiaries. The selected & matured projects are to be proposed to be realised with EU funding and implemented by UNDP. The inclusion of any bi-communal project aspects, either in terms of physicality or implementation, is to be promoted where possible.  **Expected Output(s):**   * Output 1: Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) and its governance mechanism established * Output 2: Support to local communities in the identification of infrastructure needs. * Output 3: Support to local communities in the preparation of sector specific Master Plan/s. * Output 4: Support to local communities in the preparation & implementation of selected infrastructure project designs, works, supplies and supervision. * Output 5: Increasing capacity of local administration & engineering expertise. * Output 6: Visibility & awareness raising.   Within this context, UNDP is seeking to recruit an Evaluation Expert to carry out an independent evaluation of the final project results. | | | | |
| **III. Description of Responsibilities and Deliverables** | | | | |
| The objective of the assignment is to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the project outputs in terms of their: relevance; impact; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability; gender; theory of change or results/outcome map; stakeholders and partnership strategy. The mid-term evaluation should also provide recommendations for any improvements that can be made for the continuation of the project.  The evaluation should enable UNDP in Cyprus, the European Union and other stakeholders to draw lessons in order to improve the implementation of the project. Given some of the issues already identified during a lessons learned exercise conducted at the beginning of 2021 by an external expert, it is expected that the expert will provide some practical solutions on how to improve the governance mechanisms of the project and their modus operandi.  The consultant will work under the direct supervision of the Programme and Communications Analyst, in close consultation with the LIF Project Manager and the Programme Team. The project team will provide administrative and logistical support as needed.  In order to achieve the above objective, the main tasks of the Evaluation Expert are:  **Desk Review Phase**; Conduct a comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents and draft and submit an inception report, with appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation, as well as the work plan and any technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented below  **Field Visit**; Carry out field visits to undertake interviews with relevant stakeholders  **Draft Report;** Draft a first draft evaluation report. The evaluation report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following sections:   * Title * Table of contents * List of acronyms and abbreviations * Executive summary * Introduction * Description of the intervention * Evaluation scope and objectives * Evaluation methodology * Data analysis * Findings and conclusions * Recommendations * Lessons learned * Report annexes   ***Final report***; Based on the draft report and the comments provided by UNDP and the EU, the Evaluation Expert will produce a final report. The final report provides the complete content of the report as per the main outline proposed above. Upon completion of the draft final report, UNDP and other stakeholders’ feedback will provide additional feedback. The final report will be completed by the evaluator 10 days after UNDP provides the feedback.  The following evaluation criteria and related evaluation questions are proposed for the evaluation process; however, these can be expanded and modified by the Evaluation Expert in consultation with UNDP:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions suggested** | | Relevance | * Is the project relevant for the main beneficiary * Has the initiative tackled the key issues? | | Effectiveness | * To what level the project has reached the results stated in the project document? | | Sustainability | * Will the project results last in time? * Are there jeopardizing aspects that have not been considered or abated by the project actions? * Has ownership of the actions and impact been transferred to the corresponding stakeholders? * Do the beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the results of the project and maintain and further develop the results * Which measures to ensure sustainability have proved more effective? | | Impact | * Is there evidence of long lasting desired changes? * Has the initiative influenced policy making at different levels? * Has the project impacted the desired target actors? * To what degree the has the project contributed to the development taken place with regards the overall project objectives? | | Efficiency | * Have resources been used efficiently? * Have efforts for integrated approach been made appropriately? | | Stakeholders and Partnership Strategy | * Who are the major actors and partners involved in the project and how were their roles and interests safeguareded ? * Was the partnership strategy effective? | | Evaluation | * Can the project be evaluated credibly? * Were intended results (outputs, outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable? * Were monitoring systems in place? | | Theory of Change or Results/Outcome Map | * What are the underlying rationales and assumptions or theory that defines the relationships or chain of results that lead initiative strategies to intended outcomes? * What are the assumptions, factors or risks inherent in the design that may influence whether the initiative succeeds or fails? | | Gender | * What effects were realized in terms of gender equality, if any? * Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within the project? |  * The response to the above questions should be followed by specific short and long term recommendations that could be undertaken by UNDP and other stakeholder. * These analyses have to be done for each output and for the overall project. * The evaluator is responsible for refining the evaluation methodology, evaluation questions, carrying out the evaluation and delivering to UNDP a draft report and a final report. * The key stakeholders, those involved in the implementation, those served or affected by the project and the users of the evaluation should be involved in the evaluation process. * Finalize the evaluation report, including incorporation of feedback from UNDP and the EU.   **Methodology and Evaluation Ethics**  The Evaluation Expert may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods it deems appropriate to conduct the project final evaluation. Methods should include: desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; field visits; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. However, a combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The Evaluation Expert is expected to revise the methodological approach in consultation with key stakeholders as necessary. The Evaluation Expert should present both quantitative data and qualitative findings and data.  The Evaluation Expert is expected to hold interviews and meetings with relevant staff of UNDP, the EU, and partners, and beneficiaries and is expected to share the list of interview questions for interviewee’s to be conducted beforehand, and receive feedback and clearance from UNDP.  The suggested methodology should be compatible with the UNDP approach to evaluations as described in the [*Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/).    The Evaluation Expert is expected to use its findings and expertise to identify the lessons learned, and to propose recommendations for improving the project’s future efforts toward achieving the expected results.  The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNED ‘[*Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)*.’* The International Consultant must address any critical issues in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.  ***Other Requirements***  All records from the evaluation (e.g., interview transcripts or summaries) must be provided to the UNDP Evaluation Manager. All quantitative data collected by the evaluation team must be provided in an electronic file in easily readable format agreed upon with the UNDP Evaluation Manager. The data should be organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation.  **Outputs/Deliverables**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Deliverable/Output** | **Description** | **Due date** | | **Deliverable/Output 1** | Inception report including details of the methodology, questionnaire, list of interviewees and work plan | 1 week after signing of the contract | | **Deliverable/Output 2** | Completion of field visits, meetings and interviews including data gathered and synthesised. | 3 weeks after signing of the contract | | **Deliverable/Output 3** | Production of 1st draft Evaluation report. The evaluation report should include the following:   * Executive summary. The executive summary should be 3-5 pages in length and summarize the purpose, background of the project being evaluated, main evaluation questions, methods, findings, conclusions, and recommendations and lessons learned (if applicable); * Introduction; * Description of the evaluation methodology. The evaluation methodology shall be explained in the report in detail. Limitations to the evaluation shall be disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (e.g., selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.); * Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods and/or implementation strategy; * Assessment and analysis of the efficacy of operational procedures utilised * Key findings; * Conclusions and recommendations for the future project implementation; * Annexes including   + Itinerary;   + List of persons interviewed;   + Summary of field visits;   + List of documents reviewed;   + All tools used in conducting the evaluation, such as questionnaires, checklists, and discussion guides, including client online survey and/or questionnaire (if any) used and summary of results;   + The Evaluation Scope of Work;   + Any other relevant material that supports evaluation findings and recommendations;   + Sources of information, properly identified and listed;   + Disclosure of conflicts of interest form from the evaluator, either attesting to a lack of conflict of interest or describing existing conflict of interest; | 5 weeks after signing of the contract | | **Deliverable/Output 4** | Production of the Final Evaluation report including incorporation of feedback from UNDP and the EU. | 6 weeks after signing of the contract | | | | | |
| **IV. Competencies** | | | | |
| **Corporate Competencies:**   * Committed to professionalism, impartiality, accountability and integrity; * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, ethnicity, and age sensitivity and adaptability; * Demonstrates substantial experience in gender equality. Actively promotes gender equality in all activities; * Treats all people fairly without favouritism.   **Functional Competencies:**   * Ability to work effectively within a team and develop good relationships with counterparts and stakeholders; * Ability to synthesise research and draw conclusion on the related subjects; * Ability to pay attention to details; * Excellent interpersonal skills and ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing; * Ability to establish effective working relations in a multicultural team environment; * Good organisational skills; * Commitment to accomplish work; * Responds positively to critical feedback; * Results and task oriented.   **Professionalism:**   * Shows pride in work and in achievements. * Demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter. * Is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results. * Is motivated by professional rather than personal concerns. * Shows persistence when faced with difficult problems or challenges; remains calm in stressful situations.   **Communication:**   * Speaks and writes clearly and effectively. * Listens to others, correctly interprets messages from others and responds appropriately. * Asks questions to clarify and exhibits interest in having two-way communication. * Demonstrates openness in sharing information and keeping people informed.   **Planning & Organizing:**   * Identifies priority activities and assignments; adjusts priorities as required. * Allocates appropriate amount of time and resources for completing work. * Foresees risks and allows for contingencies when planning. * Monitors and adjusts plans and actions as necessary. * Uses time efficiently. | | | | |
| **V. Qualifications** | | | | |
| Education: | | * Master’s degree in social sciences, international development or other related qualification. | | |
| Experience: | | * At least 8 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level is required. * At least 5 years’ experience with peacebuilding and confidence building programmes . Previous work experience in Cyprus, is considered an asset. * Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of development interventions is required. Previous experience of undertaking evaluations for UNDP is considered an asset. | | |
| Language Requirements: | | * Fluency in English. Excellent analytical and report writing skills in clear and fluent English. *(10 points)* | | |
| **VI. Submission of Applications and Remuneration** | | | | |
| **Application:**  Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:   * CV or Personal History (P11): Applicants are required to submit CV or a P11 Form. The UNDP P11 Form can be downloaded from:   <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc>   * Reference; Contact details of 3 references   **Financial Proposal:**  Applicants are requested to submit a lump sum financial proposal in euro for the group of outputs listed below as follows:   * Outputs 1 and 2 per this ToR * Output 3 and 4 as per this ToR   The financial proposal shall cover all expenditures including fees, health insurance, vaccination, international (all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel), accommodation, and local travel (place of residence to office and office to place of residence), cost of living and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services. Leave benefits (annual, sick, paternity, maternity) are not applicable to Individual Contractors and absent days including weekends and office holidays are not payable.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Output/Deliverable** | **Financial offer (in Euro)** | | Deliverables 1 and 2 as per the ToR |  | | Deliverables 3 and 4 as per the ToR |  | | **Total financial proposal in euro** |  |   **Logistics of the Assignment:**  The Consultant shall arrange her/his own local travel. Cost of transportation to and from the field (location of field visits and interviews) should be excluded from the financial proposal as UNDP will provide a vehicle and driver for the planned field visits. Please note that consultants will need to provide their own laptop and other relevant equipment for working purposes. UNDP will provide office space and Internet connectivity and access to a printer and stationery  **Evaluation / Selection Process**  Candidates fully meeting the requirements will be further evaluated based on the criteria below.  Technical Criteria (CV review and interviews/desk review) – 70% of total evaluation– max. 70 points  CV review: 20 points:   * Educational qualification as defined in the ToR (5 points) * Experience as defined in the ToR (15 points)   Only candidates who obtained at least 70% of points from the CV review (who will score at least 14 points) will be eligible to be invited for an interview/desk review.  Interview/Desk review: 50 points  Experience of undertaking evaluations of development interventions (20 points)  Experience in public infrastructure investments (10 points)  Knowledge of the Cypriot context (5 points)  Knowledge of results-based management evaluation and participatory M&E methodological approaches (15 points)  Only those individual consultants who obtained at least 70% of points from the CV review and Interview/desk review (49 out of 70) will be considered for financial proposal evaluation.  Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points.  Financial scores will be calculated using the formula [lowest offer / financial offer of the candidate x 30].  UNDP applies the “Best value for money approach” – the final selection will be based on the combination of the applicants’ qualification and financial proposal.  **Payment Term:**  Payments shall be made in four installments upon the submission of the certification of payment form and the completion and approval of the following sets of outputs by UNDP:   * Deliverables 1 and 2 * Deliverables 3 and 4   **Final Selection:**  The final selection will be completed through the cumulative calculation of obtained points from Technical and Financial Evaluation. The highest cumulative scorer will be awarded the contract.  UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply. | | | | |