 

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Post Title:** | National Expert – Final Project Evaluation |
| **Project Title:** | Building Municipal Capacity for Project Implementation - BMCPI |
| **Duty Station:** | North Macedonia |
| **Duration of Assignment:**  | Estimated 30 working days (01 May – 15 June 2022) |
| **Application deadline:** | 25 April 2022, 12:00h (CET) |
| **Type of Contract:** | National Consultant (IC) |
| **Educational Background:**  | Minimum university degree in management, social sciences, engineering, development, political sciences or another relevant field |
| **Work Experience:** | At least 5 years’ experience in project design and management, project monitoring and evaluation |

# Background

**I.1 COUNTRY CONTEXT AND CHALLENGES**

Local self-governments continue to face significant challenges in improving quality of life of their citizens. The country faces many difficulties in attempting to pursue a more ambitious local development agenda, some of which include:

* **Lack of municipal-level statistical data** that could be used to prioritize distribution of available funds and track development progress.
* **Fragmented capacity of municipal administrations** **to plan, design and implement** development policies and projects and maximize the impact of the available funds.
* **Insufficient up-to-date urban planning and technical** **documentation** that is necessary to enter into appropriate investment cycles.
* **Inadequate institutional structure and share of responsibilities** among institutions of the local governance system

To be able to optimize benefits from the use of available funding instruments (e.g., EU, other international financial institutions, government budgets/programmes), municipalities need to significantly strengthen capacity to prioritize, formulate and implement development projects.

**I.2. PROJECT APPROACH & OBJECTIVES**

The **Sida**-funded “Building Municipal Capacity for Projects Implementation” (**BMCPI**) project is set to address some of the most pressing issues faced by the local government institutions in their efforts to improve the living conditions for their citizens. It aims to address the main challenges of local development and to increase municipal capacities in preparing and designing local development projects.

The project is aimed at introducing Municipal Development Index (**MDI**), as well as the comprehensive systemic-level functional analyses (**FA**) of the country’s local self-government system. Altogether, these interlinked processes (TDF, MDI, and FA), will be instrumental in prioritizing support to those municipalities that are struggling the most in terms of the socio-economic development.

The central and most investment-heavy component of the project is the so-called Technical Documentation Fund (**TDF**) which has been piloted to showcase a model financial instrument for preparation of comprehensive technical documentation for the highest priority infrastructure recovery and development projects. The TDF primarily targets **municipalities and regional development centers** that are being selected for project support through competitive procedures.

In response to the COVID-19 crisis, the TDF was upgraded to include the **health care system** in the country. This was motivated by the growing pressure for health care services, as well as the arising funding opportunities for improving the conditions in the health care facilities across the country. For this purpose, the Ministry of Health is being supported by BMCPI to secure a high-quality technical documentation for the necessary reconstruction and adaptation needs of selected health care centers.

The principal idea behind the project concept is to equip municipalities with the technical documentation basis, and a set of new knowledge and skills required to make best use of available funding mechanisms for implementation of a wide range of environmental, social, and other types of priority infrastructure (e.g., EU, Government funding instruments, donations and loans provided by donors and International Financial Institutions – IFIs).

The activities under this project are fully aligned with the efforts of the local self-governments to become better able to pursue their development agendas in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including in promoting more balanced socio-economic growth.

**I.3. SUMMARY OF EXPECTED RESULTS AND KEY OUTCOMES**

Over a period of **three years**, the project is expected to provide the following main results:

* Creating a Municipal Development Index (**MDI**) to serve as an instrument for tracking the progress of municipalities toward the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is envisaged to assist authorities in making more sound decision in distributing development funds, facilitating by this more balanced socio-economic growth.
* Carrying out a Functional Analysis (**FA**) of the local governance system targeting Ministry for Local Self-Government, the Bureau for Regional Development and the eight regional development centres, as well as the units of local self-government. The FA places special emphasis to ability of the system to deliver the development agenda at local level. It is expected to generate guidance on structural changes the system needs to undergo to improve effectiveness of the development agenda.
* Prototyping a Technical Documentation Fund (**TDF**) as a model financial instrument assisting primarily the less development municipalities in preparing comprehensive technical documentation required for accessing different funding sources (e.g., grants, loans or other funding opportunities provided by international and national sources). With the support of the TDF the project intends to provide a vast number of project beneficiaries (municipalities, regional centers and health care centers) with comprehensive technical documentation that can be used for future fundraising purposes.

The project implementation is guided by the Project Document and the subsequent adjustments in terms of budget and implementation approach in agreement with the Donor. The initial project budget was set at 1,543,338 USD, while the final project budget amounts to 2,518,462 USD and includes additional Sida, UNDP and municipal co-funding. A more detailed description of the result areas as initially set in the BMCPI ProDoc is provided in Annex 1 of these TORs.

# Purpose and Scope of the Assignment

The general objective of the assignment a final evaluation of the results of the BMCPI project in terms of their Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Gender perspective and against the project-level theory of change/logical framework. More specifically, the evaluation shall focus on the following key aspects:

1. To assess the level of utility and effects of providing support for the development of technical documentation for municipal projects.
2. To assess the capacity and potentials of partner municipalities for coordination of the process of preparation of technical documentation for infrastructure projects.
3. To assess the level of involvement of stakeholders in the project and their understanding, including financial and other commitment towards achieving the sustainability of project interventions.
4. To assess the effect, results, and contribution of determining the development index of municipalities in planning process of the future socio-economic development of municipalities.
5. To assess how the functional analysis of the local self-government system has contributed to the creation of new development policies at the local level.
6. To assess the TDF concept, results, future relevance and sustainability prospects by its institutionalization in the country systems.

The indicative/tentative evaluation questions are provided in Annex 2 of these TORs[[1]](#footnote-1).

The national evaluation expert/BMCPI, will act as the member of a three-member evaluation team, consisting of the **international lead evaluation expert** and one more **national evaluation expert responsible for the Tackling Air Pollution in the City of Skopje project**. The two national evaluation experts will work under the guidance and will support the lead international evaluation expert at all evaluation stages. Each national evaluation expert will support the lead international evaluation expert, primarily with the evaluation aspects/activities that relate to his/her share of the evaluation work and will provide his/her feedback and input to the team of evaluators. All three experts shall be hired separately and will team up upon signing of the respective individual contracts with UNDP.

These TORs describe the duties and responsibilities of the national project evaluation expert responsible for the BMCPI project.

**II.1. OVERVIEW OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The evaluation shall document the learning achievements, and positive examples and provide recommendations to enable UNDP, Sida on possible follow-up interventions. The evaluation will also highlight areas where the project performed less effectively than anticipated, the rationale behind that, and the related recommendations to be considered in similar future interventions.

Under the guidance of the lead international evaluation expert, the national evaluation expert for the BMCPI project will be responsible to:

* Contribute to developing the methodological approach of the evaluation and the workplan including realistic timelines. The evaluation methodology, evaluation questions and questionaries for different interviews, shall be refined based in the indicative list of questions listed above
* Contribute to developing the inception report, which will be submitted by the lead international evaluation expert. The inception report shall be reviewed, commented and approved by UNDP before starting with collection of information from stakeholders
* Collect the information, from project stakeholders and beneficiaries of BMCPI, which include but are not limited to the[[2]](#footnote-2):
	+ UNDP and BMCPI teams
	+ Ministry of Local Self-Government
	+ Selected Regional centers
	+ Selected municipalities / ZELS
	+ Bureau for Regional Development
	+ Key project experts (e.g., supporting TDF, MDI, FA processes)
	+ Donor representative(s) (if needed)
* Under the guidance of the lead international evaluation expert, support the analyses of the information collected. These analyses shall be conducted for each output and for the overall project
* Contribute to the development of the preliminary findings and support the lead international evaluation expert to present the findings to UNDP and the Donor
* Contribute to the preparation of the draft report and the final report by the lead international evaluation expert.

In addition, the team of national evaluation experts, under the guidance of the lead international evaluation expert, shall also consider the below points:

* The responses to the indicative questions listed above should be followed by specific short- and long-term recommendations in the draft and final evaluation report. Recommendations shall consider that not only implementation was affected by the pandemic, but also the fact that pandemic may be an influencing factor in the forthcoming period, when other similar initiatives might be implemented
* Adopt and employ the appropriate tools and practices, in order to overcome limitations for primary data collection within a COVID-19 context
* The principle of do-no-harm to the actors and beneficiaries involved in evaluation shall be considered, especially in the COVID-19 context.

The national evaluation expert for the BMCPI project will work under the direct supervision and guidance of the Lead International Evaluation Expert. The latter is responsible to consult and receive guidance from UNDP. The UNDP and BMCPI project team will provide administrative and logistical support as needed.

# Methodology and Approach[[3]](#footnote-3)

**III. 1. BRIEF PROCESS OUTLINE**

The evaluation shall include the following stages:

A ***Desk Review Phase***: A file with all documents relevant for the desk review will be provided upon signing of contract to the lead international evaluation expert and the national evaluation experts. The desk review tasks will be distributed to national consultants by the lead international consultant, in order to enable the evaluation team to conduct a comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents and embrace the respective project-specific perspective.

Support the lead international evaluation expert and contribute to conceptualization of the ***methodological approach*** of the evaluation: Under the guidance of the lead international evaluation expert, the national expert(s) may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods deemed appropriate to conduct the project final evaluation. Methods should include desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; (virtual) field visits; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. A combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The lead international evaluation expert is responsible to coordinate the work with the national consultants and to task them in getting inputs from key stakeholders, if necessary and relevant. Through the guidance of the lead international evaluation consultant, the national consultants will support in revising the methodological approach as per the feedback provided by UNDP.

Contribute and support the lead international consultant to draft the ***inception report***. The inception report shall include the list of interview questions and interviewees to be conducted. It also shall include:

* Overall approach and methodology
* Key lines of inquiry, updated list of questions and interview protocol
* Data collection tools and mechanisms
* Proposed list of interviewees
* A work plan and timelines to be agreed with the UNDP project team.

The Inception Report should include a list of key risks, limitations, and risk management strategies for the evaluation, particularly under the constraints presented by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The responsibility to submit the inception report remains with the lead international evaluation expert. Comments provided for the inception report, will be worked through by the evaluation team, under the guidance of the lead international evaluation expert. Data collection phase shall commence after the inception report is approved by UNDP.

Under the guidance of the lead national evaluation expert and in coordination with the project team, **carry out the meetings/interviews with the selected stakeholders**: A detailed list of stakeholders and their contacts will be provided to the evaluation team upon signing of contracts. The number of interviews (and possible in-country field visits) will be tasked to the national consultant by the international evaluation expert in consultation with UNDP.

The schedule for interviews shall be prepared with the international lead evaluator and will be submitted to UNDP project team for feedback. UNDP will provide the relevant contacts and, wherever necessary will facilitate the organization of meetings and interviews.

If deemed necessary, the lead international evaluation expert will participate in those meetings and interviews which will be run in English and in virtual mode, while national evaluator is expected to run the meetings and interviews in local language/s, whenever stakeholders are not proficient in English. National evaluator will feed the lead evaluator afterwards, with information from the meetings/interviews which will be run in local language/s, following the form and template agreed with the lead evaluator.

Once the field visits are completed, the lead evaluation expert, with inputs from his/her team of national evaluators, will develop and present the preliminary findings of the evaluation to UNDP. The national evaluation expert is expected to support the lead evaluation expert in preparing and presenting the preliminary findings of the evaluation to UNDP.

***Draft Report:*** take lead role in developing the first draft evaluation report for BMCPI. The responsibility for the submission of the draft evaluation report to UNDP that will provide their feedback to the evaluation team through the international lead evaluation expert. The draft evaluation report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following[[4]](#footnote-4):

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

***Final report*** - Based on the draft report and the comments provided by UNDP, the national evaluation expert will support the lead international evaluation expert and contribute to the production of the final report. The final report will provide the complete content as per the main outline proposed above. The final report must be approved by UNDP.

Considering COVID-19 pandemic challenges and constraints, especially when field missions are restricted, the evaluation team is expected to utilize remote data collection methods and ensure that a robust and utilization-focused methodology is implemented.

The suggested methodology should be compatible with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and UNDG Guidance. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/publications/4312151e.pdf>

The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘[*Ethical*](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)[*Guidelines for Evaluation*](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)*.’* The International Expert 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 the security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

# III. 2. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

Specific tasks include the following with the timelines indicated:

* **Deliverable 1:** Inception report – submitted by the lead international evaluator with collective input of the national evaluators including the adjusted evaluation Methodology (including work-plan, evaluation tools, activities and deliverables), Evaluation matrix (including key criteria, indicators, and questions) based on the Desk Review of relevant project documents (by 10.05.2022)
* **Deliverable 2:** Draft Evaluation Report – submitted by the lead international evaluator with collective input of the national evaluators (by 05.06.2022)
* **Deliverable 3**: Final Evaluation Report – submitted by the lead international evaluator with collective input of the national evaluators, and by incorporating the feedback provided by UNDP (by 10.06.2022)
* **Deliverable 4**: An exit presentation on findings and recommendations (optional, by 15.06.2022)

# Qualification Requirements

## IV. 1 KEY COMPETENCES

## Corporate Competencies:

* + Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards
	+ Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP
	+ Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
	+ Treats all people fairly without favouritism
	+ Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

## Functional Competencies:

* + Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in team
	+ Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities
	+ Strong organisational, coordination and time management skills
	+ Ability to organise tasks independently and assume responsibility
	+ Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
	+ Ability to work under pressure and tight deadlines
	+ Ability to adapt solutions and proposals to specificities of client organizations.

# IV. 2. REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

## Education:

## Experience:

* Minimum university degree in management, social sciences, engineering, development, political sciences, or another relevant field.
* At least 5 years’ of demonstrated experience in project design and management, project monitoring and evaluation in development sectors
* Experience from at least 2 relevant assignments (project design, project monitoring and evaluation)
* Experience in areas of interest of the BMCPI project is considered a strong asset (construction project management, preparation of technical documentation for construction project, local governance issues, institutional building)

## Language skills:

* + Excellent oral and written proficiency in English and local languages is required.

# Evaluation of Applicants

The award of the contract shall be made to the offeror whose offer has been evaluated and determined as Cumulative analysis:

a) Being responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score based on the following weight of technical and financial criteria for solicitation as per the schedule below:

\* Technical criteria weight: 70%

\* Financial criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70%) in the technical evaluation shall be considered for the financial evaluation.

For the considered offers in the financial evaluation only, the lowest price offer will receive 30 points. The other offers will receive points in relation to the lowest offer, based on the following formula: (Pn/ Pl) \* 30 where Pl is the financial offer being evaluated and Pn is the lowest financial offer received.

## Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation:

## Criteria A – Educational background (minimum university degree in management, social sciences, engineering, development, political sciences or another relevant field) – max 15 points

Criteria B – Years of experience in areas of interest of the project (construction project management, development projects, governance, institutional building) (min. 5 required) – max 25 points

Criteria C - Experience in project design and implementation, monitoring, and evaluation in development sectors, especially in areas of relevance to the project (e.g., construction project management, local development) (minimum 2 assignments) – max of 30 points

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum points 70** |
| Educational background (minimum universitydegreeinmanagement, social sciences, engineering, development, political sciences or another relevant field) | 15 |
| Years of experience in areas of interest of the project (construction project management, development projects, governance, institutional building) (min. 5 required)5 years = 196-7 years = 228+ years = 25 | 25 |
| Experience in project design and implementation, monitoring, and evaluation in development sectors, especially in areas of relevance to the project (e.g., construction project management, local development) (minimum 2 assignments)2 assignments = 153-5 assignment = 255+ assignments = 30 | 30 |

## Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation

For the considered offers in the financial evaluation only, the lowest price offer will receive 30 points. The other offers will receive points in relation to the lowest offer, based on the following formula: (Pn/ Pl) \* 30 where Pl is the financial offer being evaluated and Pn is the lowest financial offer received.

**VI. Application Procedure**

Interested offerors are invited submit the following documents/information to be considered:

1. Offeror’s letter, attached to this email

2. Most updated CV with focus on required qualification as well as the contact details of at least three (3) professional references

3. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment;

4. Financial Proposal. The financial proposal must be expressed in the form of a lumpsum all-inclusive cost, supported by breakdown of costs as per template provided in MK Denars for this consultancy.

The financial proposal must take into account various expenses that will be incurred during the contract, including: the daily professional fee; cost of travel out of Skopje duty station (if required); communications, any other expenses related to this assignment.

**UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality, and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.**

**Annex 1.**BMCPI: Expected Results (from ProDoc)

The expected results of the project are in line with the Sustainable Development Goals, the Partnership for Sustainable Development: United Nations Strategy (2016-2020), the UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021) and the UNDP Country Programme Document (2016-2020). They are also aligned with national strategic documents such as the Work Programme of the Government for 2017-2020, the Programme for Sustainable Local Development and Decentralization 2015-2020, the Strategy for Regional Development 2009-2019, and the Public Administration Reform Strategy 2018-2022.

The project has three main outputs:

**1. Creation of a clear and simple index of municipal development**

The Municipal Development Index will be calculated for all Macedonia’s municipalities in line with a simple but robust methodology, and publicly available in both published and online formats.

*Indicative activities:*

* Design of the Index, including determination of key and non-key indicators; weight attribution; and formula calculation
* Research and assessment on data availability and plans to collect new/missing data
* Consultations with peers, partners and the public
* Data collection, processing and calculation of the Index
* Public presentation of the Index

Preparation of policy recommendations based on the Index, especially for balanced regional development

**2.** **Functional analysis of the local governance system to enhance development capacity**

Functional analysis carried out; findings and recommendations presented to national, regional and local partners; and support provided with implementation.

Specific activities for municipalities and regional development centres include:

* Agreement on functional analysis methodology aligned with MISA approach
* Data collection and processing, quantitative and qualitative analysis
* Preliminary findings presented and consulted with the partners and other interested parties
* Finalization of the study, presentation of the findings and recommendations to the public
* Work with pilot municipalities/regional development centres to implement recommendations

Specific activities for the Bureau for Regional Development (BRD) and the MLSG would include:

* Conducting a functional analysis aimed at reaching a clear understanding of BRD and MLSG functions, identifying gaps and overlaps, and recommending internal structural changes;
* Supporting the BRD and MLSG in adapting their internal organizations according to the recommendations from the functional analysis; and
* Supporting the BRD and MLSG in improving the operational flow of work processes, aiming at higher efficiency in creating policies and monitoring their implementation in coordination with an array of other government bodies.

**3. Establishment of a “technical documentation fund” for local development projects**

“Technical documentation fund” established through formal decisions as a UNDP managed fund. Internal procedures and documents designed and approved by the Project board.

*Indicative activities:*

* Research and analysis of the (potential) sources of funding for local development projects requiring technical documentation
* Assignment of the Fund management responsibilities
* Transfer of knowledge and experience on sustainable urban/rural planning and development (drawing, if and where relevant, from the experience of the Swedish International Centre for Local Democracy and other good practices) to municipal/regional counterparts
* Snapshot review of the existing local development strategies, programmes and priority lists, in order to identify priority development projects and classify them according to maturity, and eligibility for Government’s and other sources of funding
* Design and approval of Fund’s statutes, documents and forms: eligibility of applicants and types of documentation to be co-financed; evaluation criteria; co-financing rates; calls for applications and application forms, methods of communication; grant agreements; reporting procedures and forms; and other requirements
* Communication to the potential beneficiaries – national and local public presentation events
* Launch of a call for applications (for individual municipalities or for a group of municipalities through inter-municipal cooperation)

Tendering and preparation of technical (and other) documentation

Mobilization of resources to ensure sustainability of the Fund

Compilation and sharing of lessons learned and good practices

**Annex 2. Indicative Evaluation Questions**

Below are listed the key indicative ***Evaluation Questions,*** to guide the evaluation, based on the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The list of questions is not exhaustive and final and therefore the team of experts under the supervision and guidance of the lead international expert, will be expected to adjust the list and submit it as part of the Inception Report. The final list of questions and the evaluation methodology will be discussed and agreed with the UNDP/BMCPI as well as with the Donor (Sida).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Key indicative questions** |
| **RELEVANCE** | * To what extent the project was designed, to respond to the analysis made at the project design phase and (if relevant) to the changing context?
* To what extent did the project respond to the emerging key needs of partners and beneficiaries?
* Did the project’s theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the project approach is expected to produce the desired change?
* Did the project create any measurable systemic change on the key areas of intervention (MDI, FA, TDF) in the course of its implementation? Are changes expected to happen in the future with/without follow-up interventions? To what extent did project result inform institutional response/change?
* Have any changes been made to the project’s design during the implementation? If yes, did they lead to design improvements?
* To what extent did the pandemic affect the relevance of the project to the beneficiaries? Did the modifications made to implementation in pandemic circumstances influence the relevance of the project to the beneficiaries?
* Are the key project areas/results (TDF, MDI, FA) expected to remain relevant in future? What actions need to be taken to ensure continued relevance of the key project results?
* Did and (if so) how did the project use the capacity development opportunities aiming at stakeholders? What adjustments in the implementation approach should be considered for their improved use in the future?
 |
| **EFFICIENCY** | * To what extent did the project achieve the results in its proposed timeline?
* Have all implementing partners used human resources provisioned for this project to their maximum efficiency?
* How well did the project collect and use data to monitor results? How timely was data collection? What challenged incurred and what lessons can be used for the future?
* How did the MDI model evolve in response to data availability and verification of data relevance by stakeholders, as well as the new census data?
* How the Covid-19 restrictions and protective measures affected the efficiency of the implementation?
* Overall, did the project’s management arrangements and implementation strategy provide value-for-money? Have resources been used efficiently? How does the overall cost-efficiency of intervention look like (per key project components – MDI, FA, TDF)?
* Are there any duplication of efforts (within and outside UNDP)? Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined?
* What are the key lessons learnt on the implementation efficiency to be considered in a possible follow-up project phase?
 |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | * To what extent did the project achieve its intended objectives (MDI, FA, TDF)?
* How effective was the cooperation among supporting and implementing partners?
* What challenges arose during implementation, and how did the Project Team respond to these challenges?
* How effective and clear the project's targeting strategy was in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting?
* To what extent did the project complement work with different agencies, have a strategic coherence of approach?
* How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere and be consider for possible follow-up interventions?
* With the view to Covid-19 circumstances, to what extent the online activities conducted to respect the social distance, were effective, versus the classical face to face ones?
* What are the lessons learnt from the implementation that can be used for future possible crisis situations (e.g., pandemic, economic, security crisis)?
* What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?
* What lessons can be used to improve effectiveness of MDI, FA and TDF as part of a possible follow-up complementary project?
 |
| **SUSTAINABILITY****/ OWNERSHIP** | * To what extent the achieved results are likely to sustain over time? What are the factors that enable or impede the sustainability of the results?
* How strong the commitment of the beneficiaries and stakeholders is to sustain the results of the project?
* What possible next steps should be taken to replicate, scale-up and ensure sustainability of the key results (MDI, FA, TDF)?
* Has the project sought and achieved synergies with other projects (within and outside UNDP’s portfolio) and how has this impacted project sustainability?
* To what extent has the project explored and taken advantage of co-funding from other sources?
* Has the ownership of actions been transferred to the targeted project audience?
* Do beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the results of the project, to maintain them and can they use the learning from the project in their future initiatives?
* How has the project strengthened the capacity of project stakeholders?
* What, if any, catalytic effects did the project have (financial and non-financial)?
 |
| **IMPACT** | * What has been the positive and negative, intended, and unintended, long-term effects of this project (e.g., MDI, FA, TDF, TDF)?
* What follow-up projects/initiatives need to be considered to ensure enhanced impact, replication and/or scaling-up of project results?
* What pre-conditions need to be met (e.g., among) stakeholders for better impact?
* Are there project components with more limited impact that should be re-evaluated/reconsidered/phased out in future interventions?
* What possible contextual changes could favor greater impact and what contextual changes could dimmish impacts of the project’s three main areas of intervention (MDI, FA, TDF)?
 |
| **GENDER** | * To what extent were gender considerations mainstreamed throughout the project?
* Was gender mainstreaming underpinned by appropriate budget allocations specific to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE)?
* How has the pandemic affected or hindered the participation and contribution of women and girls in this project in general?
* Are there any gender mainstreaming lessons to be considered as part of a possible follow-up intervention in the key project areas?
* How were the gender mainstreaming requirements addressed in the project’s three key components (MDI, FA, TDF)
 |

**Annex 3. List of recommended BMCPI Partners/Beneficiaries for interview:**

1. Ministry of Local Self-Government (MLSG)
2. Bureau for Regional Development
3. Ministry of Information Society and Administration (MISA)
4. Association of the Units of Local Self-Government (ZELS)
5. Partner Municipalities[[5]](#footnote-5)
6. Partner regional development centers (Polog and Vardar planning regions)
7. Ministry of Health (for 9 health care centers provided with technical documentation)
8. Key project experts
* Municipal Development Index (1)
* Functional Analysis (2)
* Technical Documentation Fund (2)

**Annex 4. List of Documents for review**

1. **Project Document**
2. **Project progress reports (narrative & financial)**
3. **Municipal Development Index (MDI)**
* Conceptual framework for municipalities
* Final report:Update and improvement of the Municipal Development Index
1. **Functional Analysis (FA)**
* Functional Analysis of the Ministry of Local Self-Government
* Policy paper on decentralization reform
* Report for internal organization and systematization
* Rulebook for internal organization and systematization
* Piloting of FA at local level, 4 municipalities (Vevcani, Veles, Berovo, Gostivar) and 2 regions (Southeast & Northeast), Report on finding and recommendation
1. **Technical Documentation Fund, TDF**
* Application form for technical documentation (first and second Call)
* Guidelines for applicants
* Sample technical documentation (for municipalities, regions, health care centers)

**Annex 5. Evaluation matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub- questions** | **Data sources** | **Data collection methods/ tools** | **Indicators/ success standards** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 6. Outline of the evaluation report format**

1. Title and opening pages with details of the project/ programme/ outcome being evaluated and the evaluation team.

2. Project and evaluation details, including the project title, Atlas number, budgets and project dates and other key information.

3. Table of contents.

4. List of acronyms and abbreviations.

5. Executive summary, a stand-alone section of maximum four pages including the quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. Introduction and overview, explaining what is being evaluated and why.

7. Description of the intervention being evaluated, providing the basis for readers to understand the design, general logic, results framework (theory of change) and other relevant information of the initiative being evaluated.

8. Evaluation scope and objectives, to provide a clear explanation of the evaluation scope, primary objectives and main questions.

9. Evaluation approach and methods, describing in detail the selected methodological approaches and methods.

10. Data analysis, describing the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions.

11. Findings and conclusions, setting out the evaluation findings, based on analysis of the data collected, and the conclusions drawn from these findings.

12. Recommendations. The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make.

13. Lessons learned. As appropriate and when requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation of the intervention.

14. All findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned need to consider gender equality and women’s empowerment, disability, and other cross-cutting issues.

15. Annexes. At a minimum these should include:

a. TOR for the evaluation.

b. Evaluation matrix and data collection instruments

c. List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited.

d. List of supporting documents reviewed.

**Annex 7. Pledge of ethical conduct forms (sent as attachment)**

**Annex 8. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines** (sent as attachment), highlighting:

* 1. • Inception report template (Section 4)
	2. • Evaluation report template and expected content (Section 4)
	3. • Quality Assessment process (Section 6)
1. The selected evaluation experts will provide a list of updated draft evaluation questions which will be shared with UNDP and the Donor. The relevant comments will need to be incorporated in the final versions of the questions prior to the start of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The list of stakeholders to be interviewed may be adjusted based on requests by UNDP and/or the Donor. Please also see Annex 3 for additional details on stakeholders for interview. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This is a starting/tentative methodology which can be adjusted as part of the Inception Report to be submitted by the lead international evaluation expert based on the input of the national evaluation experts. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A more detailed outline of content of the evaluation report is provided in Annex 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Following the review of municipalities supported by the project (around 60), the evaluators will propose a sample of municipalities to be contacted/interviewed during the evaluation process. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)