



I. Position Information

Title: **International Evaluation Specialist for Mid-term Project Evaluation of the Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts in Kosovo (SAEK) Project III**

Department/Unit: Governance and Peacebuilding Portfolio

Reports to: SAEK III Project Manager

Duty Station: Prishtina, Kosovo / Homebased

Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): Kosovo

Duration of Assignment: 23 May – 31 July 2022

Need for presence of IC consultant in office:

X partial

intermittent (explain)

full time/office based (needs justification from the Requesting Unit)

Provision of Support Services:

Office space: Yes - partial

Equipment (laptop etc): No

Secretarial/Logistical Services: Yes - responsible SAEK III team members

II. Background Information

The Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts in Kosovo (SAEK III) Project, supports the implementation of a legal and institutional framework in line with international standards with a measurable track record of successfully prosecuted corruption cases and a robust preventive mechanism uncovering alleged conflicts of interest and abuse of authority. The aim is to enable and ensure key suppressive and preventive bodies are maximizing their abilities to detect, investigate, prosecute, adjudicate corruption related offenses as well as confiscate criminal proceeds derived thereof.

SAEK III Project is based on a three-tier approach necessary to achieve tangible and sustainable results in anti-corruption:

- Policy level work to assist in fulfilling technical and legal requirements and demonstrate effective implementation of laws, SDG 16, and strategies and action plans through:

Outcome 1: Policy, regulatory and monitoring framework on the prevention and suppression of corruption enhanced

Focusing on the implementation of policies, legislation, plans and strategies in line with international standards on anti-corruption in order to enable anti-corruption institutions to oversee integrity and transparency of central and local institutions and of political parties. The effective implementation of the policy and legislative framework will close existing loopholes for corruption and ensure increased integrity and transparency.

- Structural level work to establish a legal and institutional framework for coordinated prosecutorial led joint investigations of financial crime and demonstrable effectiveness in assets recovery so as to effectively sanction crime, remove generated illicit proceeds and increase public pressure to produce results in the fight against corruption, through:

Outcome 2: Anti-corruption institutions detect, repatriate hidden stolen assets and process corruption cases effectively

Focusing on strengthening anti-corruption institutions and providing them with the capacity and tools to effectively detect and suppress corruption. If relevant anti-corruption institutions operate in line with an improved policy and legislative framework and have improved capacities and tools to detect corruption and suppress corruption then these institutions will have the capacities to seize illicit assets and to ensure their repatriation to the public budget.

- Partnerships with CSO's to develop mechanisms for reporting corruption and holding institutions accountable, through:
- **Outcome 3: Civic engagement mechanisms to hold institutions accountable strengthened**

Focusing on the development of civic engagement mechanisms through initiatives on corruption reporting, referral and monitoring and on transparently displaying public expenditure resulting in increased awareness on how corruption is tackled and capacities to hold public institutions accountable. If civic engagement mechanisms are established and used through initiatives on corruption reporting, referral and monitoring, and increased awareness on how corruption is tackled, then public institutions will be influenced to be more accountable to citizens on deterring, sanctioning corruption and transparent in their decision-making processes.

III. Objective of the Assignment

Conduct a mid-term evaluation of the SAEK III project activities to note progress against indicators, identify possible implementation gaps, and propose corrective actions.

IV. Scope of Work and Mid-term Evaluation Questions

The international evaluation specialist will undertake the following duties and responsibilities:

- In close cooperation with the Local Evaluation Specialist, conduct a comprehensive desk review of project-related documents and UNDP evaluation policies and, based on this information, draft and submit an inception report containing the following: a.) the appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation; b.) the work plan and any technical instruments to be used during the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented. Together with the Local Evaluation Specialist conduct on-site field visits, meetings, discussions, and interviews with stakeholders (Kosovo Anti-Corruption Agency, Chief Prosecution, Supreme Court, Ministry of Justice, FIU, Internews Kosova, GAP Institute, ROLAG, etc.) The Evaluation Team is also expected to conduct interviews and meetings with UNDP senior management and Programme, and SAEK III team.
- Draft a mid-term evaluation report based on the agreed methodology, a presentation of findings, presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations exploring possible adjustments for the remaining period of project's implementation.
- The mid-term evaluation report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined below:
 - 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
 - Lessons learned
 - Report annexes

Finalize the mid-term evaluation report, accounting for the UNDP and stakeholders' feedback on the first draft.

Evaluation questions:**RELEVANCE:**

- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent/Is the project relevant in terms of the needs and potentials/resources of the key stakeholders and beneficiaries? What were the main circumstantial factors taken into account in the project plans and implementation?
- Is sufficient local ownership demonstrated?
- Have there been any changes in policies and strategy development that have affected the project? If yes, have necessary revisions and adaptations been designed?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
- What are the areas of relevance for future interventions in the target area?

IMPACT, EFFECTIVENESS, AND EFFICIENCY:

- To what extent Is the project on track to achieve its expected results? What has been achieved?
- How have the synergies between the responsible implementing partners and UNDP contributed to project goals?
- What challenges have been faced? What has been done to address the potential challenges/problems?
- Has the project appropriately reached its target groups? Is the project serving the needs of vulnerable groups, i.e. women, youth, minorities?
- Have the capacity development measures served the needs and demands of the stakeholders? What has been achieved in institutionalizing the acquired knowledge and skills?
- In what ways could the project *improve its efforts in the second half of project's implementation toward achieving the expected results and maximizing impact?*
- Are the expected results clearly defined, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and are they achievable with the planned approach and resources?
- How well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? (in comparison to the plan)
- Are the management and administrative arrangements sufficient to ensure efficient implementation of the project?
- How has the project implemented the commitments to promote ownership, alignment, harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability?
- How has donor coordination impacted the efficiency of implementation and results?

SUSTAINABILITY:

- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?

- How will the project ensure sustainability of its results and impacts when the project will have ended (i.e. continuity of developed capacities, use of knowledge, improved practices, etc.)?
- Does the project have a concrete and realistic exit strategy to ensure sustainability?
- In case of sustainability risks, are sufficient mitigation measures proposed?

V. Methodology and Evaluation Ethics

The Evaluation Team may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods it deems appropriate to conduct the project mid-term evaluation. Methods should include a desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; field visits; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. However, a combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The Evaluation Team is expected to revise the methodological approach in consultation with key stakeholders as necessary, particularly the intended users and those affected by mid-term evaluation results. The Team should present its findings in both quantitative data and qualitative recommendations.

The Evaluation Team is expected to hold interviews and meetings with the relevant staff of UNDP, SAEK III, main Project partners and beneficiaries (Kosovo Anti-Corruption Agency, Prosecution, Supreme Court, Ministry of Justice, FIU, Tax Administration, Internews Kosova, GAP Institute, etc.) The Team will be expected to share the list of interviews to be conducted with UNDP SAEK III beforehand.

The suggested methodology should be compatible with the UNDP approach to evaluations as described in the [Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation](#).

The Evaluation Team is expected to use its findings and expertise to identify the lessons learned, and to propose recommendations for improving the project's future efforts toward achieving the expected results. Prior to the Evaluation Team's arrival, it will receive a list of documents to be consulted for its review. The Team will have latitude to design a detailed evaluation scope and methodology and will present a proposed work plan as part of the inception report to UNDP before arrival to Kosovo in order to optimize the time spent during the field mission.

The mid-term evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNED '[Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#).' The Evaluation Team 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.

VI. Expected Results	Tentative due dates:	Approval by:
Methodology to be applied during the mid-term evaluation, as well as the work plan and technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment is drafted, submitted, and endorsed by UNDP.	27 May 2022	SAEK III Project Manager/Programme Team
Field visits, meetings and interviews in Kosovo are conducted, gathering data to be used in the mid-term evaluation report.	13 June 2022	SAEK III Project Manager/Programme Team
Draft and submit mid-term Evaluation report with the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, a presentation of the lessons learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP and its partners suggesting possible adjustments for the remaining period of project's implementation is formulated, based on the findings acquired during the field mission to Kosovo and through the relevant project documentation, jointly with the Local Evaluation Specialist.	27 June 2022	SAEK III Project Manager/Programme Team
A mid-term Final Evaluation report accounting for the UNDP and stakeholders' feedback on the first draft is produced and validated by UNDP.	11 July 2022	SAEK III Project Manager/Programme Team

VII. Requirements and qualifications
<p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Master's degree in social sciences, economic development, public administration or other related qualification. <p>Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least 5 years of demonstrated relevant work experience/expertise in evaluation of development interventions at national and/or international level is required. ▪ Demonstrable experience with evaluation processes for capacity development initiatives in the anti-corruption field; ▪ Previous work experience in the Western Balkans, preferably Kosovo in particular, is considered an asset. ▪ Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of development interventions is required. <p>Language requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fluent in English. Excellent analytical and report writing skills in clear and fluent English; ▪ Knowledge of Albanian and/or Serbian languages is an asset.

VIII. Scope of price proposal and schedule of payments

Remuneration - Lump Sum Amount:

The Contract is based on lump-sum remuneration and shall be processed subject to deliverables as per the schedule listed below:

- Deliverable 1 - Submission of the Methodology: **20% of the total amount of the contract**
- Deliverable 2 – Draft mid-term Evaluation report: **50% of the total amount of the contract**
- Deliverable 3 – Final mid-term Evaluation report: **30% of the total amount of the contract**

Payments will be made upon successful completion of the deliverables and their acceptance by the SAEK III project manager, including submission of a certificate of payment.

IX. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- A **CV** indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

- **Technical proposal:** a max. 2-page document briefly outlining the methodology envisaged for the assignment for delivering the expected results within the indicated timeframe.

- **Financial proposal:** The consultant is expected to provide an all-inclusive lump sum amount/financial proposal (including professional fee, travel costs, and other incidentals).

- **A copy of Diplomas and a copy of passport**

X. Criteria for selection of the Best Offer

Combined scoring method – where the qualifications will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.

- Technical criteria weight: 70 (70% of total obtainable scores). Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 (70%) points on the technical part will be considered for the financial evaluation.

- Financial criteria weight: 30 (30% of total obtainable scores).

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive / compliant / acceptable; and

Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

XI. Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Committed to professionalism, impartiality, accountability and integrity;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, ethnicity, and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Demonstrates substantial experience in gender equality. Actively promotes gender equality in all activities;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional Competencies:

- Ability to work effectively within a team and develop good relationships with counterparts and stakeholders;
- Ability to synthesise research and draw conclusion on the related subjects;
- Ability to pay attention to details;
- Excellent interpersonal skills and ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing;
- Ability to establish effective working relations in a multicultural team environment;
- Good organisational skills;
- Commitment to accomplish work;
- Responds positively to critical feedback;
- Results and task oriented.

This TOR is accepted by:

Signature: _____

DocuSigned by:
Krenar Loshi
0017F6DF38D9410...

Name: _____

Krenar Loshi

Date of signature: _____

22-May-2022