

TERMS OF REFERENCE
for
Individual Consultancy Services on Final Evaluation
within the scope of
Local Administration Reform Phase III (LAR III) Project
Funded by the European Union



1) INTRODUCTION

This Terms of Reference (ToR) specifies the details for the Individual Consultancy Assignment for Final Evaluation of Local Administration Reform Phase III Project implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (hereinafter UNDP), of which the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change are co-beneficiaries.

The evaluation will focus on the assessment of the activities implemented and whether the activities led to the achievement of the planned results and objectives (in accordance with the Project Document, Donor Agreement and associated modifications made during implementation). As a result of this evaluation, identifying the lessons learned and recommendations from the evaluator/s are expected to improve the quality of the planning, preparation and implementation of subsequent projects in future.

2) BACKGROUND INFORMATION

As the continuation of the first phase (implemented between 2005-2007) and second phase (implemented between 2009-2011); Local Administration Reform Phase III Project (LAR Phase III) (“the Project”, hereinafter) is a European Union (EU) funded Project, implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) within the scope of a Pillar Assessed Grant Agreement, signed between Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU) (on 25 May 2018) and UNDP (on 28 June 2018), and endorsed for financing by the EU (on 18 June 2018). The lead beneficiary of the Project is the Ministry of Interior (MoI), Directorate General for Provincial Administrations. In line with the institutional roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC) amended with the introduction of the new Presidential System of Government, Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC) was proposed to be the co-beneficiary of the Project. The process was initiated by the MoEUCC through an official letter addressed to the MoI (dated 29 August 2018). The MoI evaluated the co-beneficiary status request of the MoEUCC and drafted an agreement letter (dated 31 August 2018) addressed to the MoEUCC. Then, co-beneficiary status of the MoEUCC was approved by the CFCU and the Delegation of the European Union to Turkey (EUD) on 28 December 2018.

The overall objective of the Project is to ensure effective, inclusive, accountable and participatory local governance in Turkey, through support to further implementation of the local administration reform process undertaken between 2003-2013, in line with international standards. The specific objective of the project is to develop and strengthen the administrative capacity and cooperation of Ministry of Interior (MoI), Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC) and Local Authorities themselves in the task of ensuring the effective implementation of the new local administration model in line with principles of democratic governance.

The first and second phases of the Project (i.e. LAR I and LAR II) which were also financed by the EU, were implemented by the MoI and UNDP between 2005-2007 and 2009-2011 respectively. The Project was developed in the light of gains from LAR I and II. Therefore, most of the activities build on and/or complement the activities that have been realized within LAR II with a view to further the LAR and increase the impact.

The Project started with certain implementation delays due to above mentioned amendment in the project management structure with the introduction of new Presidential System of Government, as well as due to delays in decision making in the lead up to the local elections in March 2019. Therefore, it was planned to request 12 months of no-cost extension. However, following the Covid-19 outbreak, it was deemed necessary to request an additional 4 months of extension. In agreement with the Beneficiary Institutions, CFCU and EUD, the project was granted with 16 months no-cost extension until 28 October 2021. The project did not cease operation during the pandemic and focused on desk-based activities and continued consultative events through use of online tools until the end of June 2021. Finally, the Project has been granted an additional 9 months of no-cost extension, until 28 July 2022. In terms of progress, necessary measures have been taken to address the challenges faced and the project implementation has been accelerated.

Project Profile:

Title of the Action	Local Administration Reform Phase III (LAR III)
Total budget	EUR 5.449.904,79
Location(s)	Turkey Kahramanmaraş, Sivas, Safranbolu/Karabük (pilots of Activity A.1.1.5 Effective Human Resources Management System) Kütahya, Esenler/İstanbul, Eskişehir (pilots of Activity A.1.1.9 Municipal Enterprises) Denizli, Pamukkale/Denizli, Şahinbey/Gaziantep, Eskişehir, Ordu, Konya (pilots of Activity A.1.1.8 Performance Management System) Balıkesir, Tekirdağ, Malatya, Hatay, Trabzon, Muğla (pilots of Activity A.2.2.2 Participatory Mechanisms) Balıkesir, Denizli, Ankara, Gaziantep, Muğla, Eskişehir, Konya (pilots of Activity A.2.2.1 Local Service Delivery Standards)
Duration	49 months (24+16+9)
Objectives of the Action	The overall objective of the Project is to ensure effective, inclusive, accountable and participatory local governance in Turkey, in particular through support to further implementation of the LARs undertaken between 2003-2013, in line with international standards. The specific objective of the project is to develop and strengthen the administrative capacity and cooperation of Ministry of Interior (MoI), MoEUCC and Local Authorities themselves in the task of ensuring the effective implementation of the new local administration model in line with principles of democratic governance.
UNDSC outcome and CPD Output served (2016-2020)	UNDCS OUTCOME 2.1: By 2020, central and local administrations and other actors more effectively protect and promote human rights, and adopt transparent, accountable, pluralistic and gender sensitive governance systems, with the full participation of civil society, including the most vulnerable. CPD Output 2.1 Strengthened local, regional and national governance mechanisms for participatory, accountable and transparent services

UNSDCF outcome and CPD Output served (2021-2025)	UNSDCF OUTCOME 4.1: By 2025, governance systems are more transparent, accountable, inclusive, and rights-based, with the participation of civil society, and judiciary services are improved in quality CPD Output 4.1 Legislative and policy making processes and governance mechanisms at national and subnational level strengthened to promote participation, transparency and accountability CPD Output 4.6 Use of digital technologies and e-governance enabled for improved public services and other government functions
Primary SDGs served	SDG 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.
Target group(s)¹	30 Metropolitan Municipalities (MMs) and affiliated organizations, provincial and other district municipalities, central and provincial staff of Ministry of Interior/General Directorate for Provincial Administrations (GDPA); Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change/General Directorate of Local Authorities (GDLA), Ministry of Treasury and Finance (MoTF), Presidency of Strategy and Budget and Union of Municipalities of Turkey (UMT); governorates, district governorates, special provincial administrations, elected representatives and professionals serving in these institutions.
Estimated results	Component 1: Effective Local Service Delivery R.1.1. Administrative and operational capacities for efficient provision of local services enhanced Component 2: Capacity Building for New Metropolitan Municipality Model and Inclusive Local Governance Processes R.2.1. Administrative and operational capacities of the local authorities for the implementation of new Metropolitan Municipality Model strengthened, R.2.2. Institutional capacity of the local authorities in terms of service delivery and adoption of the principles of democratic governance enhanced, R.2.3. Public awareness on urbanization enhanced through institutional and individual capacity enhancement programmes, Component 3: Online Management Information Systems R.3.1. Efficiency of the local services enhanced through online managements systems.

Project Progress:

Output 1: Administrative and operational capacities for efficient provision of local services enhanced

Cumulatively 13 recommendation reports on legislative changes were prepared. 10 municipalities participated in EU Acquis fact-finding mission in August 2019 and 20 municipalities have attended the two 2-day workshops on EU Acquis chapters (the participants to the fact-finding mission were also included in these workshops). They had the opportunity to discuss the acquis adaptation with relevant staff of central bodies.

Online interviews for fact-finding purposes were organized with several local institutions and municipalities, as well as the relevant institutions and selected municipalities in 10 EU member states. The contacts developed during the study visits to France and Spain proved to be very effective in identifying further contacts for interviews and exchange of different practices related to local services within Component 1.

Within the scope of Activity A.1.1.8. “**Developing Performance Management System to be Adopted by MMs and District Municipalities**” two 2-day face-to-face pilot trainings, which were deemed to be

¹ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will directly benefit from the action at the action purpose level.

one of the most essential and impactful outputs of the Project, were provided to selected representatives of 4 pilot municipalities. 120 representatives benefitted from these trainings. Within the scope of the same Activity, 4 regional meetings were organized to generate ideas about how to improve the preparation of the performance programs. Around 100 representatives from MMs, MDMs and DMs, including mayors, district governors, NGOs, universities, relevant and attended the meetings.

6 out of 13 legislative recommendations were then reflected into the regulations and other legislative documents by MoEUCC. These legislative measures are on “the loan system of local authorities”, “regulation for business licenses”, “infrastructure works in rural areas”, “collection of municipal accounts receivables” and local service delivery standards in “transportation services, rural services, care (early childhood, elderly care) and fire services”.

Output 2: Administrative and operational capacities of the local authorities for the implementation of new Metropolitan Municipality Model strengthened

Between March-June 2021, 20 experience sharing meetings were organized and 70 best practices were shared by municipalities and more than 3,000 representatives from not only various Metropolitan Municipalities (MMs) and district municipalities, but also NGOs and citizens’ assemblies benefitted from these meetings which served as experience sharing platform. In the extension (Addendum No. 2) period covering October 2021-July 2022, a digital experience sharing platform will be designed and launched to ease communication flow among municipalities and enhance knowledge and experience sharing. As of January 2022, draft roadmap is about to be developed which will be discussed and finalized upon discussions held and recommendations of consultation meeting participants and stakeholders.

More than 90 training programs were organized and almost 5,000 staff of local authorities benefitted from these trainings.

Within the scope of Component 2, under Activity A.2.1.4. “**Develop and Deliver Customized General Management and Job Skills Training Modules for the Use of the GDLA to be Delivered to new MMs**”, 37 trainings on different topics were delivered and almost 3,700 staff from MMs and MDMs benefitted from them. All these trainings were transformed into distance learning modules ready for access of all staff of local authorities.

Output 3: Institutional capacity of the local authorities in terms of service delivery and adoption of the principles of democratic governance enhanced

Local service delivery standards in 5 service areas were developed to be implemented in 10 pilot MMs. Implementation guidelines on service standards were prepared.

Within the scope of Activity A.2.2.1. “**Develop and implement local service delivery standards**” 10 one-day seminars were organized in selected MMs including Tekirdağ, Eskişehir, Ordu, Ankara, Kayseri, Balıkesir, Konya, Gaziantep, Denizli and Muğla with around 750 participants in total. Through pilot applications, these standards are expected to be adopted by these 10 MMs.

During the extension period, two two-day pilot studies will be conducted in two metropolitan municipalities in each area, in order to examine the practices regarding standards in 5 service areas (fire, public health, public health in public transportation, elderly home care and rural services). The pilot provinces for each service area were determined as follows: Balıkesir and Denizli for fire services, Ankara and Gaziantep for public health services, Muğla and Denizli for elderly home care services, Ankara and Eskişehir for public health in public transportation services, Konya and Muğla for rural services. These pilot studies will be completed in February-May 2022 period. As a result of these pilot studies, Local Service Standard Documents in 5 service areas will be developed in cooperation with Turkish Standards Institution. A comprehensive recommendation report has been produced within the scope of Activity A.2.2.4. “**Develop a policy paper on reforming the Local Government Electoral System and Strengthening of Municipal Councils**”. Report discusses the local election system and

representation problems. To improve the local election system and democratic governance, suggestions were made on representation of women and youth, expanding the potential candidate pool, primary elections, preferential voting, quota candidacy and electoral threshold. In addition to this, a new representation model has been proposed, which provides a fairer representation of the districts in the metropolitan municipal councils. The possible results of this model have been demonstrated through simulations.

Within the scope of Activity A.2.2.2. **“Develop and Implement Participatory Local Governance Model for new 14 MM”**, an implementation guideline on participatory mechanisms was developed which included the general framework and main components of participation, planning of the process, local actors and their roles, best practices from Turkey and around the world and proposed approaches/tools for each phase of participation. The Implementation Guideline has been tested in 3 pilot provinces (Hatay, Malatya, Tekirdağ and Balıkesir) including districts and citizens’ assemblies through trainings. For the extension period, two more pilot provinces were determined, and the pilot studies are extended to 6 pilots in total.

Output 4: Public awareness on urbanization enhanced through institutional and individual capacity enhancement programmes

Within the scope of Activity A.2.3.2. **“Design and implement capacity enhancement programs on urban awareness for the staff of Women Centres, Child Development Centres and other relevant social service units”**, 5 training modules were prepared targeting the staff of women, child, youth, elderly and disabled care centers and these trainings were carried out online through the Zoom application and broadcasted live on the YouTube channel of the Project. **478 people** participated in the online trainings via the Zoom application. The gender distribution of the participants was 70% female and 30% male. All trainings are accessible on YouTube.

Within the scope of Activity A.2.3.3. **“Design and implement capacity enhancement programs on urban awareness to be delivered to selected staff of MMs”**, a training module targeting the relevant staff of municipalities was developed and this training module was delivered online through Zoom application 5 times and the last one was broadcasted live on the YouTube channel of the Project. **418 people** participated in the online trainings via the Zoom application. The gender distribution of the participants was 65% female and 35% male.

Output 5: Efficiency of the local services enhanced through online managements systems

Local Information System (<https://formyerelbilgi.csb.gov.tr/>) is a system in which the identity, financial, inventory, social, demographic, structuring and institutional data of 1619 institutions (MMs, Metropolitan District Municipalities, Provincial Municipalities, District Municipalities, Town Municipalities, Affiliated Administrations and Local Administration Unions) can be gathered, visualized and reported (<https://raporyerelbilgi.csb.gov.tr/>) through the business intelligence software TURBOARD.

With this system; all of the local administration units (1619 institutions in total) will be able to submit information to Yerel Bilgi. UNDP design report proposed 288 indicators in total for Yerel Bilgi. MoEUCC went through this list and prepared initial 30 forms on financials, personnel, vehicles, social services, green areas, bicycle roads, public transportation, elderly care, illegal construction, etc. These 30 forms contain over 200 number of indicators in total. All defined users will be able to enter their data through 30 different forms. Forms can be created, edited or removed at any time. However, this authority will be defined only to the administrator account. The remaining institutions will not have any right to take any action regarding the structures of the forms.

Approximately 1600 users from local government bodies (including municipality staff, affiliated organisation staff, provincial administrative unit staff, provincial directorates of MoEUCC) and 10 personnel from MoEUCC/GDLA were trained on Yerel Bilgi and data-oriented work.

3) SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

The subject Individual Consultancy Assignment on Final Project Evaluation for LAR III will be initiated for preparing an independent evaluation that measures the expected results and specific objectives achieved against those stated in the Project Document and associated modifications and identifying the lessons learned which are relevant to the planning, preparation and implementation phases of a possible subsequent project through the conduct of an evaluation mission.

This final evaluation has the following *specific objectives*:

- To measure to what extent the Project has contributed to solve the needs identified in the design phase.
- To measure Project's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on expected results (outputs) and specific objectives (outcomes), against what was originally planned or officially revised.
- To measure the project contribution to the objectives set in the UNDP Country Program Document (CPD), United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS), 11th National Development Plan of Turkey, SDGs as well as Strategic Plan of MoEUCC and MoI, Annual Programme of Presidency, European Charter of Local Self-Governments, EU acquis chapters "23- Judiciary and Fundamental Rights" and "24-Justice, Freedom and Security", 19- Social Policy and Employment, 33- Financial and Budgetary Provisions, along with 17 SDGs.
- To assess both negative and positive factors that have facilitated or hampered progress in achieving the Project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management and resource allocation.
- To assess the extent to which the application of the rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming are integrated within planning and implementation of the Project.
- To generate substantive evidence-based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability) and to support the sustainability of the Project or some of its components.

4) KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Considering the evaluation parameters, the Individual Consultant is expected to analyse data and share his/her findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by this analysis. As a reference point for the evaluation, the Individual Consultant is provided with indicative evaluation questions below, which are expected to be amended, elaborated and submitted and shall be included as an annex to the final version of the evaluation report.

Relevance:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse the extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and international norms:

1. To what extent was the LAR III design relevant in supporting Ministry of Interior (MoI), Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC) and Local Authorities implement effective, inclusive, accountable and participatory local governance in Turkey, in line with international standards and principles of democratic governance?
2. To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant to national priorities (including 11th National Development Plan (NDP), Strategy of Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC), European Charter of Local Self-governments and EU norms and EU acquis)?
3. What other key intervention areas could be integrated to a possible follow up LAR III Project, which would increase relevance in relation to 11th National Development Plan (NDP), Strategy of Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC), European Charter of Local Self-governments and EU norms and EU acquis?

4. To what extent was the design and strategy of LAR III in line with UN and UNDP priorities (CPD and UNSDCF)?
5. To what extent was the theory of change applied in LAR III relevant to ensuring an effective, inclusive, accountable and participatory local governance in Turkey?
6. To what extent was this Project designed as rights based and gender sensitive? (See Gender Equality related documents to be reviewed under Annex C.)
7. To what extent does the Project create synergy/linkages with other projects and interventions in the country?

Effectiveness:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the Project objectives have been achieved or how likely they are to be achieved:

1. To what extent did the Project contribute to the attainment of the development of outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the Project Document's logical framework until the end of the project duration? (The Individual Consultant is expected to provide detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs and 2) achievement of results).
2. Compared to 2017 when this project officially started, to what extent local authorities and MoEUCC are better able to implement the new local administration model and to what extent are any improvements in performance attributable to LAR III?
3. To what extent, LAR Phase I and Phase II lessons learned were considered during the current phase and efforts were taken to reach certain results that weren't achieved in the previous phase.
4. What are the key factors contributing to Project success or underachievement until the mid-term of project execution? How might this be improved in the future?
5. Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
6. To what extent has the Project contributed to the implementation of Local Administration Reforms since 2014 and the fulfilment of the objectives of 11th NDP, United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS) and CPD goals, as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, above stated EU acquis and EU normative frameworks)?
7. To what extent has the Project contributed to the well-being and human rights of vulnerable groups, including, women and girls? Did the Project effectively contribute to "leave no one behind agenda" and successfully integrate human rights-based approach (HRBA)?
8. To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted on the effectiveness of LAR III?
9. Did Covid-19 measures have a positive or negative effect on the achievement of Project results?

Efficiency:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and the results have been delivered with the least costly way possible:

1. To what extent were the LAR III outputs delivered on time to ensure high quality?
2. Was funding enough for achievement of results? (funding analysis)
3. What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by UNDP?
4. To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted on the efficiency of the LAR III?
5. To what extent was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives/projects that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
6. How well did Project Management work for achievement of results?
7. To what extent did Project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?

8. What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?

Sustainability:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyse to what extent the Project's positive actions are likely to continue during the remainder portion and after the end of the Project:

1. To what extent will the LAR III achievements be sustained? What are the possible systems, structures, staff that will ensure its sustainability? What are the challenges and opportunities?
2. To what extent have development partners committed to providing continuing support? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the Project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
3. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining Project benefits?
4. To what extent will the Project be replicable or scaled up?
5. To what extent will the benefits and outcomes continue after external donor funding ends? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends?
6. What can be done to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes?

Cross-Cutting Issues:

All the above-mentioned evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

1. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the Project?
2. To what extent has the Project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
3. Is the gender marker data assigned to this Project, representative of reality?
4. To what extent has the Project contributed to "leave no one behind agenda" (including disabled, elderly, youth, refugees etc)?
5. To what extent have environment and climate change issues been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the Project?

5) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the Inception Report and the Final Evaluation Report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality.

It is strongly suggested that the evaluation should use a mixed method approach whenever possible – collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data using multiple sources in order to draw valid and evidence-based findings and conclusions and practical recommendations. The Individual Consultant is expected not only to collect quantitative/qualitative data, but also is highly encouraged to review all relevant reports providing quantitative data collected by LAR III.

However, the Individual Consultant is expected to propose and determine a sound evaluation design and methodology (including detailed methodology to answer each evaluation question) and submit it to UNDP in the inception report, following a review of all key relevant documents and meeting with UNDP. Final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will be made through consultation between UNDP and the Individual Consultant about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives, as well as answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The Individual Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with stakeholders. Methods to be used by the evaluation consultant to collect and analyze the required data shall include but not limited to:

Desk Review: This should include a review of inter alia:

- Project document
- Result Framework/M&E Framework
- Project Quality Assurance Reports
- Annual Work Plans
- Annual Narrative Reports
- Highlights of Project Board meetings
- Studies relating to the country context and situation

Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed

Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including UNDP, Government partners, UN colleagues, development partners, beneficiaries

Key informant interviews with relevant stakeholders from implementing partners, donors, pilot municipalities, beneficiaries supported by LAR III²

Analysis of LAR III's funding, budgets and expenditure generated from Atlas, which will be provided by UNDP.

Analysis and interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data available from various credible sources.

The Individual Consultant will ensure triangulation of the various data sources. Data and evidence will be triangulated with multiple sources to address evaluation questions. The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the Evaluation Consultant.

Gender and Human Rights-Based Approach

As part of the requirement, evaluation must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated gender equality perspective and rights-based approach. The Individual Consultant is requested to review UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation during the inception phase.

In addition, the methodology used in the final evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods should be human rights- and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, etc. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of final evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for enhanced gender responsive and rights-based approach of the Project. These evaluation approach and methodology should consider different types of groups in the LAR III Project intervention – women, youth, minorities and vulnerable groups.

² All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments of individuals.

6) ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

The evaluation of the Project is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the UNEG.

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Individual Consultant and Project Team in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The Individual Consultant must corroborate all assertions and disagreements with him/her must be noted.
- **Integrity.** The Individual Consultant will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The Individual Consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the interviews, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to UNDP. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by UNDP in this Terms of Reference.
- **Validation of information.** The Individual Consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the Individual Consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports/deliverables.** If delivery of the reports/deliverables is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is lower than of the quality desired by UNDP, the Individual Consultant will not be entitled for any payment regarding that specific report/deliverable, even if s/he has invested time/resources for submission of the report/deliverable.

7) GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Consultant shall be responsible to the Evaluation Manager (in this case UNDP's Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst) for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned throughout this Terms of Reference. All the reports are subject to approval from Evaluation Manager, for the payments to be affected to the Individual Consultant.

The following are the key actors involved in the implementation of this Final Evaluation:

1. Evaluation Manager

This role will be conducted by the **Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst of UNDP** who will have the following functions:

- Supervise the evaluation process throughout the main phases of the evaluation (preparation of the ToR, implementation and management and use of the evaluation)
- Participate in the selection and recruitment of the Individual Consultant
- Provide the Individual Consultant with administrative support and required data and documentation

- Ensure the evaluation deliverables meet the required quality
- Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the Individual Consultant
- Review the Inception Report, Draft Evaluation Report and Final Evaluation Report and give necessary approvals on behalf of UNDP
- Collect and consolidate comments on draft evaluation reports and share with the evaluation consultant for finalization of the evaluation report
- Contribute to the development of management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP
- Ensure evaluation Terms of Reference, final evaluation reports, management responses are publicly available through Evaluation Resource Center within the specified timeframe
- Facilitate, monitor and report on implementation of management responses on a periodic basis

2. Inclusive and Democratic Governance Portfolio Manager will have the following functions:

- Establish the Evaluation Reference Group with key project partners when needed
- Ensure and safeguard the independence of the evaluation
- Provide comments and clarifications on the Terms of Reference, Draft Inception Report and Draft Evaluation Report
- Ensure the Individual Consultant's access to all information, data and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who are expected to participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods
- Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions
- Ensure dissemination of the evaluation report to key stakeholders
- Be responsible for implementation of key actions of the management response

3. Individual Consultant will be responsible for the overall coordination and quality of all the deliverables to be produced. It is the Individual Consultant who will be held accountable to UNDP in the quality of the final product. The Individual Consultant will conduct the evaluation study by fulfilling their contractual duties and responsibilities in line with this ToR, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and ethical guidelines. This includes submission of all deliverables stipulated under Article 13 (Price and Schedule of Payments) of this ToR, to the satisfaction of UNDP. Individual Consultant's functions do not include any managerial, supervisory and/or representative functions in UNDP, end beneficiaries and implementing partners. All documents and data provided to the Individual Consultant are confidential and cannot be used for any other purpose or shared with a third party without any written approval from UNDP. The scope of work for the Individual Consultant of this evaluation will include but not be limited to:

- To develop and finalize the inception report that will include elaboration of how each evaluation question will be answered along with proposed methods, proposed sources of data, and data collection and analysis procedures;
- To design the tools and data collection;
- To conduct data collection, analysis and interpretation;
- To develop the draft evaluation report;
- To finalize the evaluation report;
- To present findings and debrief;

- To plan, execute and report, kickoff and feedback meetings and debriefings;
- To ensure compliance with the ToR of the LAR III Evaluation; and
- To utilize best practice evaluation methodologies.

4. Evaluation Reference Group: Ministry of Interior (MoI), Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change (MoEUCC), Union of Municipalities of Turkey (UMT), Directorate for EU Affairs at Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DoEU), Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU), Delegation of European Union to Turkey (EUD) and Presidency of Strategy and Budget (PSB) will function as the Evaluation Reference Group. This Group is composed of the representatives of the major stakeholders in the Project and will review and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation process, as well as on the evaluation products (more specifically comments and suggestions on the draft report and final report) and options for improvement.

8) ACTIVITIES, DELIVERABLES AND SCHEDULE

The Individual Consultant shall develop and submit below listed deliverables to the satisfaction of UNDP, which shall be the basis of the payments to the Individual Consultant:

Deliverable	Estimated Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC (Indicative)	Activity	Responsible Party	Expected Date of Completion*
Draft Inception Report	6	Kick-off Meeting	UNDP	16 March 2022
		Review of relevant documentation and submission of Draft Inception Report	Individual Consultant	28 March 2022
		Providing feedback to Draft Inception Report	UNDP	11 April 2022
Final Inception Report		Submission of Final Inception Report based on the feedback received from UNDP	Individual Consultant	18 April 2022
Draft Evaluation Report	14	Data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders	Individual Consultant	18-29 April and 9-16 May 2022
		Delivery of the Draft Evaluation Report, compiling findings from data collection and interviews with key stakeholders	Individual Consultant	6 June 2022
Final Evaluation Report	9	Review the Draft Evaluation Report and provide feedback	UNDP, Evaluation Reference Group	27 June 2022
		Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report by taking into consideration the feedback received from UNDP	Individual Consultant	18 July 2022
Debriefing/Presentation	1	Debriefing/Presentation to UNDP and Stakeholders	Individual Consultant	28 July 2022

*Dates may be changed according to actual contract start date.

The number of person/days are solely provided to give the Individual Consultant an idea on the work to be undertaken. The payment for each deliverable will be made in accordance with the lump-sum price of each deliverable, irrespective of the number of person/days to be actually invested by the Individual Consultant for the completion of each respective deliverable.

1) Inception Report:

This report will be 30 pages maximum in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for carrying out the independent evaluation. The report should justify why the said methods are the most appropriate, given the set of evaluation questions identified in the ToR. It will also include a mission programme which indicates proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. This document will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Individual Consultant and UNDP. In principle, the report is expected to contain the outline stated in **Annex A** of this Terms of Reference.

2) Draft Evaluation Report:

The Draft Evaluation Report will contain the same sections as the Final Evaluation Report detailed under **Annex B** of this Terms of Reference. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the Project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The following rating system must be used for evaluation criteria, as well as result ratings in the logical framework (outcomes).

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Cross-cutting</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability	2. Relevant (R)
5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings	3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks	1. Not Relevant (NR)
4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks	
3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings	1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	
2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems		
1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems		
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>		
Not Applicable (N/A)		
Unable to Assess (U/A)		

UNDP will disseminate the Draft Evaluation Report to the Evaluation Reference Group in order to seek their comments and suggestions. Comments and suggestions of UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group will be collected in an audit trail and will be shared with the Individual Consultant for it to make final revisions.

3) Final Evaluation Report:

The Final Evaluation Report will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the Project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should contain, at

minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality. In addition, the Final Evaluation Report should contain clear recommendations that are concrete, feasible and easy to understand. The Final Evaluation Report will be shared with UNDP to be disseminated to the key stakeholders. In principle, this report is expected to contain the sections stated in **Annex B** of this Terms of Reference. The Individual Consultant will also submit its answers to the Audit Trail to show the actions taken/not taken and revisions made/not made in line with suggestions and recommendations of UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group providing detailed justifications in each case.

4) Debriefing/Presentation:

A meeting will be organized with key stakeholders including UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group members to present findings, conclusions and recommendations. The meeting will be held either via Zoom or in-person at UNDP Turkey Country Office Premises in Ankara, as deemed appropriate by UNDP. The presentation will dwell on lessons learned but will also be forward looking in proposing recommendations that are actionable by UNDP and its implementing partners.

Reporting Line

The Individual Consultant will be responsible to the Evaluation Manager (in this case UNDP's Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst) for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned throughout this Terms of Reference. All the reports are subject to approval from Evaluation Manager, for the payments to be affected to the Individual Consultant.

Reporting Conditions

The reporting language will be English. All information should be provided in electronic version in word format. The Individual Consultant shall be solely liable for the accuracy and reliability of the data provided, along with links to sources of information used.

Title Rights

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

9) FACILITIES TO BE PROVIDED BY UNDP

UNDP Turkey CO won't be providing a facility for the Consultant to work during the contract. UNDP will provide background materials for Consultant's review, reference and use. Neither UNDP nor any of the project partners are required to provide any physical facility for the work of the Consultant. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g., working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection, etc.) and at the discretion of UNDP and/or the relevant project partners, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the Consultant. UNDP and/or the relevant project partners will facilitate meetings between the Consultant and other stakeholders, when needed.

10) EXPECTED DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The contract is expected to start on 15 March 2022 (starting date is indicative and may be updated considering actual contract signature date) and expire on 28 July 2022.

11) PLACE OF WORK

Duty Station for the Assignment is Home-based. The Individual Consultant will be requested to travel to provinces where the Project is being implemented, as indicated in the expected interview schedule table below. All the costs associated with travel, accommodation and any other living costs shall be borne by UNDP. UNDP will arrange economy class roundtrip flight tickets through its contracted Travel Agency.

Assignment-related travel and accommodation costs outside of the Duty Station, which are pre-approved by UNDP, will be borne by UNDP in line with UNDP’s corporate rules and regulations. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the Consultant, through UNDP’s official Travel Agency or,
- Reimbursed to the Consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the Consultants and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table or,
- Covered by the combination of both options.

The following guidance on travel compensation is provided as per UNDP practice:

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	Full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipt, etc. by the Consultant with the UNDP’s F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

As per UNDSS rules, the IC is responsible for completing necessary online security trainings and submitting certificates and travel clearance prior to assignment-related travels.

However, as the COVID-19 pandemic is still continuing, field visits defined under Expected Interview Schedule might not be possible and interviews might be held virtually through telecommuting and online conferencing tools, or any other alternative method to protect the safety of the Individual Consultant, key actors and informants whilst ensuring the successful conduct of evaluation mission. “Interviews” referred in this Terms of Reference comprises such telecommuting and online conferencing tools as well. All travel arrangements shall be subject to pre-approval of the UNDP.

Expected Interview Schedule

Partners/Stakeholder(s) to be Interviewed	Location ³	Estimated Day(s) of Interview*
UNDP	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Ministry of Interior, Directorate General of Provincial Administrations	Ankara, Turkey	0,5

³ The locations of partners and stakeholders do not rule out the probability of a remote monitoring mission. The names of cities are there to inform the reader about the location of stakeholders and do not mean that the Individual Consultant must pay an in-person field visit to each city indicated in this list.

Ministry of Environment Urbanization and Climate Change, Directorate General of Local Authorities	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Union of Municipalities	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Strategy Budget Office of the Presidency	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate of EU Affairs (DoEU)	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Delegation of European Union to Turkey	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Central Finance and Contracts Unit	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
Presidential Board of Local Administration Policies	Ankara, Turkey	0,5
At least 6 pilot municipalities (to be determined by UNDP, for each activity including pilot application, at least two pilot municipalities will be selected)	Turkey	6
ESTIMATED TOTAL		10,5

*The number of estimated days is solely provided to give the Individual Consultant an idea on the work to be undertaken. More days may need to be allocated depending on methodology and field work proposed in the inception report. The payment for each deliverable will be made in accordance with the lump-sum price of deliverables, irrespective of the number of person/days to be invested by the Individual Consultant for the completion of each respective deliverable.

COVID-19 Specific Measures:

The Individual Consultant shall review all local regulations, as well as that of UN and UNDP concerning the measures, he/she must take during performance of the contract in the context of COVID-19. The Individual Consultant shall take all measures against COVID-19 imposed by local regulations, as well as by UN and UNDP during performance of the contract to protect his/her health and social rights, as well as UNDP personnel, Project Stakeholders and third parties. UNDP shall not be held accountable for any COVID-19 related health risks or events that are caused by negligence of the Individual Consultant and/or any other third party.

12) SKILLS REQUIREMENTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

The expected qualifications/experience of the Individual Consultant are as follows:

	Minimum Qualification Requirements	Assets
General Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelor's Degree in public administration, law, economics, international relations, development studies or any other relevant field. • Good command of spoken and written English. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master's or Ph.D. Degree in law, development studies, political science, public administration or any other relevant field.
General Professional Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 7 years of overall professional experience in research design, field work, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research strategies, including but not limited to focus groups, surveys and interview techniques. 	
Specific Professional Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 5 years of professional international experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, research or review of development projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader, sole evaluator or as a team member. • Experience in evaluation of democratic governance, public administration, local government projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having conducted 3 to 5 evaluations, assessments, research or review of development projects on democratic governance, public administration, local government projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator. • Having conducted 6 to 9 evaluations, assessments, research or review of development projects on democratic governance, public administration, local government projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator. • Having conducted more than 9 evaluations, assessments, research or review of development projects on democratic governance, public administration, local government projects, programmes or thematic areas either as team leader or sole evaluator. • Experience in evaluation of EU funded projects. • Authorship of article(s) / research paper(s) on democratic governance, public administration or local governments.
<p><u>Notes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience. • Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience. • Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience. • Experience gained prior to completion of undergraduate studies is not considered professional experience. 		

13) PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

- **Contracting Authority**

Contracting Authority for this Assignment is UNDP, and the contract amount will be provided through the respective project budget.

- **Contracting Modality**

IC – Individual Contract of UNDP.

- **Payment Schedule**

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of all corresponding deliverables by UNDP on a lump-sum basis as detailed within the below table, along with the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the Individual Consultant and approved by Evaluation Manager (Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst).

The payments will be made according to the below table:

Deliverable	Due Date	Estimated Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC (Indicative)	Review and Approvals Required
Draft Inception Report	18 April 2022	6	Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, in consultation with the Project Manager of Local Administration Reform Phase III Project
Final Inception Report			
Draft Evaluation Report	6 June 2022	14	
Final Evaluation Report	18 July 2022	9	
Debriefing/Presentation	28 July 2022	1	
Estimated Total Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC (Indicative)		30 Person/Days	

The number of person/days are solely provided to give the Individual Consultant an idea on the work to be undertaken. The payment for each deliverable will be made in accordance with the lump-sum price of each deliverable, irrespective of the number of person/days to be actually invested by the Individual Consultant for the completion of each respective deliverable.

Without submission and approval (by UNDP) of the above listed deliverables in due time and quality, the Individual Consultant shall not be entitled to receive any payment from UNDP even if he/she invests time in this assignment. While the IC may invest less or more than estimated number of person/days for each deliverable different than the estimated person/days stipulated in the above table, the amount of payment to be affected to the IC within the scope of this Assignment will be based on the lump-sum price of the deliverables.

If any of the deliverables stipulated in this Terms of Reference are not produced and delivered by the IC in due time and to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the IC has invested time to produce and deliver such deliverables.

The IC shall be paid in USD if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TRY through conversion of the USD amount by the official UN Operational Rate of Exchange applicable on the date of money transfer.

The amount paid to the Individual Consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension, income tax, etc. The amount to be paid to the Individual Consultant is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. The price proposal amount should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed), etc. UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa, etc. It is the Individual Consultant's responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

14) ANNEXES

Annex A - Outline of the Inception Report

1. **Background and context** illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
2. **Evaluation objective, purpose and scope.** A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
3. **Evaluation criteria and questions.** The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.
4. **Evaluability analysis.** Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.
5. **Cross-cutting issues.** Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analyzed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.
6. **Evaluation approach and methodology,** highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.
7. **Evaluation matrix.** This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.
8. A revised **schedule of key milestones,** deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).
9. Detailed **resource requirements** tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites
10. **Outline of the draft/final report** as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.

Annex B - Outline of the Draft and Final Evaluation Reports

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:
 - Name of the evaluation intervention.
 - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
 - Countries of the evaluation intervention.
 - Names and organizations of evaluators.
 - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
 - Acknowledgements.
2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports on second page (as one page):

Project information		
Project/outcome title		
ATLAS ID		
UNDCS Outcome and CPD Output		
Country		
Region		
Date Project document signed		
Project Dates	Start	Planned End Date
Total Committed Budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding Source		
Implementing Party		
Evaluation Information		
Evaluation type (project/outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)		
Final/midterm review/other		
Period under evaluation	Start	End
Evaluators		
Evaluator e-mail address		
Evaluation Dates	Start	Completion

3. **Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.**
4. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**

5. **Executive summary (four-page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
 - Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
 - Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
 - Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
 - Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.
6. **Introduction**
 - Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated now, and why it addressed the questions it did.
 - Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
 - Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention).
 - Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report’s intended users.
7. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide enough detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:
 - Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
 - Explain the **expected results model or results framework, implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
 - Link the intervention to **national priorities, UNDCS priorities, and objectives, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other programme or country-specific plans and goals.**
 - Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
 - Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
 - Include data and an analysis of **specific social groups** affected. Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
 - Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
 - Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
 - Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
 - Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).
8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s scope, primary objectives and main questions.
 - **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
 - **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.

- **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the criteria used in the evaluation.
 - **Evaluation questions** define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.
9. **Evaluation approach and methods.** The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. **The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups.** The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:
- **Evaluation approach.**
 - **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
 - **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
 - **Data-collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
 - **Performance standards:** the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
 - **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
 - **Ethical considerations:** the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).⁴
 - **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation consultant, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
 - **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.
10. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

⁴ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>.

11. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect gender equality and women's empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues, as well as possible unanticipated effects.
12. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment as well as to disability and other cross-cutting issues.
13. **Recommendations.** The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects. Recommendations regarding disability and other cross-cutting issues also need to be addressed.
14. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report. Gender equality and women's empowerment, disability and other cross-cutting issues should also be considered.
15. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
 - TOR for the evaluation.
 - Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
 - List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
 - List of supporting documents reviewed.
 - Project or programme results model or results framework.
 - Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
 - Code of conduct signed by evaluator.

Annex C – Documents to be Reviewed

Background Documents on Country and UNDP Priorities (will be provided after Contract Signature)

- Revised UNDP Evaluation Policy
- UNDP Guidelines on “Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit”
- UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2018-2021)
- UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (January 2021)
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020)
- Guidance on Evaluation Institutional Gender Mainstreaming (2018)
- UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
- UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations
- UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025
- UNDCS 2021-2025
- UNDP Country Programme Document 2021-2025
- 11th National Development Plan (2018-2023)
- Annual Programmes of the Presidency
- The Congress of Local Authorities and Regions Recommendations Report (2011)
- Monitoring of the European Charter of Local Self-Government in Turkey (12 February 2020)
- MM Law No: 6360 on the Establishment of 14 MM in 14 Provinces and 27 Districts and Amending Certain Laws and Decree-laws,
- Municipal Law No: 5393,
- Metropolitan Municipality Law No:5216,
- Special Provincial Administration Law No: 5302,
- UMT of Local authorities Law No: 5355,
- Abolishing General Directorate of Village Services, Law No: 5286,
- Establishing Districts within Boundaries of MM, Law No: 5747,
- Law on Appointment from General Budget Tax Revenues to Special Provincial Administrations, Law No: 5779.

Project Documents, which will be provided after Contract Signature

- Project Document of LAR III
- Grant Agreement and its Annexes (including Description of the action, budget, communication plan)
- Inception Report
- Annual Progress Reports
- Annual Workplan
- Steering Committee and Management Meeting Minutes
- ROM Reports
- Major Outputs produced so far under project components