

Mid Term Evaluation Report

Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF)

Mid-term Evaluation

Submitted to
UNDP Cyprus

Omer Ahmed Awan

09.08.2022

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 5 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 11 |
| 1.1. Background..... | 11 |
| 2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES & APPROACH | 12 |
| 2.1. Evaluation Objectives and Criteria | 12 |
| 2.2. Inception Meeting/Call..... | 13 |
| 3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY..... | 13 |
| 3.1. Desk Review and Document Analysis..... | 14 |
| 3.2. Programmatic Scope of the Assessment..... | 14 |
| 3.3. Development of Assessment Tools | 14 |
| 3.4. Data Collection | 15 |
| 3.4.1 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) | 15 |
| 3.4.2 Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) | 15 |
| 3.4.3 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)..... | 15 |
| 3.4.4 Direct Observations/Site Visits..... | 16 |
| 3.5. Development of Field Activity Plan | 16 |
| 3.6. Data Analysis | 16 |
| 3.7. Presentation on the Initial Findings..... | 16 |
| 3.8. Evaluation Limitations | 17 |
| 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS..... | 17 |
| 4.1. Relevance | 17 |
| 4.2. Effectiveness..... | 18 |
| 4.3. Efficiency..... | 21 |
| 4.3.1 Implementation Arrangements and Output’s Efficiency | 21 |
| 4.3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation..... | 23 |
| 4.3.3. Allocated Budget vs. Actual Expenditure | 23 |
| 4.4.4 UNDP’s Partnership Strategy..... | 24 |

4.5. Sustainability25

4.6. Gender Equality, Empowerment & Youth26

5. LESSONS LEARNED.....27

6. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS28

Annex

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| AB | Advisory Board |
| CfPs | Call for Proposals |
| CPD | Country Program Document |
| EC | European Commission |
| EECC | Turkish Cypriot European Union Coordination Office |
| EU | European Union |
| EUPSO | EU Program Support Office |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| KII | Key Informant Interview |
| LIF | Local Infrastructure Facility |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| OECD DAC | The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee |
| QBS | Questionnaire-Based Survey |
| TC | Turkish Cypriot |
| TOC | Theory of Change |
| UTCM | Union of TC Local Communities |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| WWTP | Waste Water Treatment Plan |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The European Commission through the UNDP Cyprus established a new instrument called “Local Infrastructure Facility” (LIF). The LIF project primarily aimed to identify, screen, mature, prepare for tender, and implement local infrastructure investments, targeting the funding on competitive basis to ensure best value for money and providing support also to the Turkish Cypriot communities with a lower technical and administrative capacity. With the key objective of providing technical assistance for the design and implementation of projects aiming at improving environmental, social and economic infrastructure in the Turkish Cypriot community, the project is aimed at **Output 1**: Establishment of the Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) Unit and its governance mechanism, **Output 2**: Support to local communities in the identification of infrastructure needs, **Output 3**: Support to local communities in the preparation of sector specific Master Plan/s, **Output 4**: Support to local communities in the preparation & implementation of selected infrastructure project designs, works, supplies and supervision, **Output 5**: Increasing capacity of local administration & engineering expertise, **Output 6**: Visibility & awareness raising.

The midterm evaluation report of the UNDP Cyprus’s Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) project was based on assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the ongoing project, identification of the key lessons learned and recommend a way forward for the remaining years of the project. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the project planning and implementation also remained a key attribute of the evaluation. Based on the data collections tool that included the documents review, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), direct observations/site visits and questionnaire-based survey, following set of evaluation findings are consolidated.

Summary of Findings

A1- Relevance: By design and based on the Theory of Change TOC, **the LIF project is highly aligned and relevant with the needs and priorities of the Turkish Cypriot Communities** as demonstrated through stakeholder consultations. ii) **In practice though, the relevance of LIF project is found to be comparatively reduced over the time span of the LIF project, primarily due to a gradual shift from the ‘bottom-up approach’ towards a ‘top-down approach’.** After the first call for proposal (CfP) whereby although no thematic areas were set, the themes under which the proposals were developed and facilitated were still very much aligned with the priorities and core responsibilities of the beneficiaries/local communities there was a consensus found in consultations with the beneficiaries that due to restrictions on the thematic areas to be funded by the LIF project, combined with the sudden hiatus in some projects and slow progress of project awards, beneficiaries feel that LIF project’s relevance to target the needs and priorities of beneficiarieslocal communities has been found as limited in recent times. It was also indicated that ‘top-down’ relevance of the projects to be funded with donor’s priorities is now given preference. It is worth mentioning that these priorities are not found as officially documented or set in any strategy document by the donor

A 2- Effectiveness- Based on the data gathered through desk review and the stakeholder consultations, the findings suggest that overall progress of the LIF project against the projects results’ framework and related indicators is limited and adversely affected by considerable delays (both due to various factors that led to the implementation inefficiencies as well as limitations caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic).

A3- Keeping in view the 2 main sources of the approved projects that are i) projects listed in the project document ii) projects selected through the CfPs, it was found that none of the projects is completed after more than 3 years of LIF implementation so far. The consensus found in the stakeholder consultations and the 0% completion rate manifests an ineffective and underachieved progress of LIF project so far

A4- Contributing Factors- Data collected through the stakeholder consultations and desk review indicated **multiple contributing factors** behind this underachieved progress of the project so far. **I) There is a general agreement among the beneficiaries that overall selection and approval criteria was clearly communicated , however the final decision and rationale to accept or reject a project (by the donor) as well related mechanisms are unclear, inconsistent, lengthy and inefficient whereby they receive limited to no feedback on the final decisions even after a year or more.** Moreover, some of the projects that are approved and under progress at certain level are being suddenly stopped/ cancelled by the donor due to reasons that are not sometimes explained in adequate, timely and transparent manner, resulting in waste of time and resources; **II) It was also found that Covid-19 Pandemic has caused adverse impact on the smooth implementation of the LIF project as it reduced physical interaction among stakeholders, therefore causing some delays;** **III) It was also found that the key contributing factor behind certain project delays and sometimes cancellation of the projects at the later stage is limited capacities of certain local communitieslocal communities to develop the proposal and/or to ensure the relevant implementation model and sustainability studies etc.** More importantly, due to the limited capacity of the local communities, most of the local communitieslocal communities used external consultancy services in order to develop and prepare a project proposal. These consultants used to participate to the capacity building activities on behalf of the local communities, which was not the objective of the LIF capacity building strategy. Nevertheless, this observation was strongly countered by certain local communities whereby they highlighted that while local communities are not directly responsible for the maturation of projects, their projects were even stopped or cancelled after 1-2 years of engagement, arguably without giving limited capacities as core reason behind such decisions.

A5- During the stakeholder consultations, there was a **clear and strong mistrust found between most of the beneficiaries (Local communities), particularly those waiting for the approval/rejection decisions and key implementation partners/donor including UNDP LIF and EU.** Moreover, this poses another challenge for the LIF project as **beneficiaries are gradually losing their interests and motivation to actively engage** as well as value the LIF project. It is also evident from the diminishing number of both local communities involved, and number of applications submitted in CfPs (**23 Local communities with 63 applications in 2019 to 8 local communities with 6 applications in 2021**

A6- . The successful completion of Covid-19 response project was found as a **fundamental example to demonstrate strong responsiveness, flexibility and adaptability** of LIF project as well as the potential of the stakeholders effective and efficient implementation competencies if well-coordinated and engaged efforts are made.

A7-While capacity building of local communities is an integral component of the LIF project, it was found that i) the existing capacity issues of the local communities to develop and implement infrastructure projects has been a continued problem as well as ii) LIF's capacity building activities to build the capacities and iii) local communities interest in such capacity building activities has seen diminishing/declining trend over the period of the project lifecycle. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the beneficiaries are involved during the maturation phase and transfer of knowledge is occurring during this stage.

A8- Lack of provision for the contingency budgetary support to **cater to the unavoidable risk of increasing prices, costs and retaining resources** due to the delays caused by the factors beyond the control of beneficiaries as well as donor's inflexibility to update/change initial budget estimates further enhance the risk of implementation even after the project is approved and goes into implementation.

A9- Efficiency- The overall implementation efficiency, particularly in terms of output delivery **is found as inefficient in general**, due to sometimes long and stringent governance, project approval and implementation mechanisms.

A10- Due to the nature of the Delegation Agreement and as indicated in the project document whereby the donor (EU) is the final authority of taking a decision on project approval, **the role of Project Steering Committee is found as limited and less empowered.**

A11- A general consensus was found among the most stakeholders that the mechanism and criteria of final approval and selection of project as well as to change the scope, decision and status of project from approved to freeze/cancelled **is not found as always transparent, clear and understandable.**

A12- Coordination and communication components of the project, particularly with reference to the beneficiaries are found as both i) **stronger links in case of approved and under progress projects** where UNDP has been actively engaged with the stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries ii) **a weaker link at multiple levels** that includes UNDP to beneficiaries with awaiting decisions on projects as well as UNDP to PSC etc.

A13-Output & Budget Efficiency- Hindered by the significant delays, Covid-19 Pandemic and changing strategic priorities of the donor, the output efficiency is found as limited. The planned vs. actual (revised) expenditure of the LIF project was found as efficient in terms of its delivery rate (2019-2021) that stood at approximately 85%.

A14- M&E- Annual Reports with results based reporting and continued monitoring of project progress are found as the **stronger attributes** of the M&E mechanism. However apart from the annual reports, it was found that timing and content of UNDP's submission of monthly/periodic information and status etc. to the PSC, partners and beneficiaries need considerable improvement in terms of time efficiency as well as the quality and depth of the content.

A 15- Partnership Strategy and Coordination- The composition of partners involved in the LIF project is found to be a **strong attribute of the project** as it includes representation from all major stakeholders. However, the coordination, engagement as well as trust building measures through consistent communication, particularly with reference to the status of the projects **were found as underachieved and needs to be improved considerably.**

A16-Sustainability- At macro level and in a structured form, there is no clear or coherent sustainability and exit strategy found at LIF project level, both in the project document as well in any other documents on how this sustainability mechanism will work, what are the risks and how these risks will be mitigated. At micro level and at individual community-based project level, **it has intrinsic and strong design-based sustainability attributes** whereby the projects funded under LIF are aimed at strengthening capacities and ensure local ownership. It is also ensured that sustainability plans for every approved project is effectively developed to assess and maintain sustainability of the projects

A17- Gender Mainstreaming- Although it is difficult to measure the impact of the project for women as beneficiaries due to no significant results on ground, the inclusion of women in composition of the advisory boards, capacity building programmes and representation in local communities were found as stronger attributes of the project

A18- Lessons Learned

❖ A less ambitious, more 'do able' results framework with effective risk identification and mitigation strategy at the inception stage are vital to maintain results-based delivery and efficient implementation. This is more relevant in

a complex scenario under which the LIF project operates that involves i) A number of thematic areas ii) community-based infrastructure-based projects that involves local communities with heterogeneous priorities and capacities. This demands a more precise, prioritized and manageable results and indicators

- ❖ Community based projects **required continued and enhanced interaction/engagement** with the community (local communities) to keep their interest, trust and motivation sustained.
- ❖ A community-based infrastructure project demands a **'bottom up' approach**, hence targeted thematic areas require prioritization as per the community needs. However, if a 'top-down' approach is unavoidable due to any reason, it is important to communicate the rationale behind the shift/approach in a way that is easily and convincingly absorbed by the beneficiaries as well as other partners, particularly the implementation agencies.
- ❖ The decision-making process for selection, approval and implementation of projects demands an **open, timely and transparent mechanism** to maintain beneficiaries trust and project credibility.
- ❖ The complete project proposal cycle with **clear, efficient and optimum processes** are vital for achieving timely delivery of the projects.
- ❖ The complex political context of projects like LIF demands a **less bureaucratic, flexible and a relatively decentralized governance mechanism** for efficient decision making, responsiveness and delivery.

A20- Recommendations- Programme Design & Coordination

- ❖ Revisit the overall scope and related Results Framework of the LIF programme at the earliest. Revised outputs with less ambitious and more realistic, indicators and targets should be developed that can be achieved and/or can be shown progress within the remaining time period of the project.
- ❖ It is also vital that the project results and/or objective should be explicitly linked with donor's priorities outlined in the aid programme, yearly programmes as well as with UNDP's strategic plan, upcoming strategies like CPD etc.
- ❖ For the remaining time period of the project, clear and concise decisions on what projects will be funded by the EC as well as future of the projects under hiatus should be taken at the earliest, (within 3-4 weeks' time at the latest) and final list of projects should be developed.
- ❖ Multi-stakeholder meetings should be conducted immediately after the final decisions on projects are taken whereby relevant beneficiaries, UNDP, UTCM EUCC and other stakeholders should participate. All decisions along with the rationale of selection/ non-selection of projects under consideration, status of the projects in progress and/or under consideration as well as any consideration for future projects should be communicated to the local communities in open and transparent manner.
- ❖ Any further call for proposal should be bound with i) **Clear and well defined selection criteria** of projects along with the thematic areas ii) since it is a Turkish Cypriot Community Targeted project, it is highly recommended that a **'bottom up' approach to identify thematic areas** for any further call should be considered whereby local communities can identify their high priority needs and thematic area may not be restricted and they should be widened as per the needs of the main targeted beneficiaries iii) **Specifically allocated and available budget to fund at least 'x' number of projects should be assured and communicated** as the integral part of any CfP to regain and ensure the motivation and incentive for the local communities to participate and apply iv) **If the identification of thematic areas with bottom-**

up approach is not possible due to unavoidable reasons such as priorities of central government, EU's strategic priorities etc., key beneficiaries along with Steering Committee should be involved in the discussions and/or informed about such decisions from the onset, with clearly communicated rationale and reasons **v) Considering the delays caused by both decision making and decisions changes processes** as well as unforeseen events like pandemic, a flexible budget allocation, particularly a contingency budget item with a specific percentage should be included in the initial budget consideration so that beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders should not suffer due to issues that are beyond their control

Implementation & Management- It is highly recommended to review and revise the overall governance and implementation mechanism of the LIF project to make the processes efficient and bring the progress back on track.

Scenario 1- Decentralized Model (Recommended)- It is strongly recommended to establish comparatively, **a more decentralized decision-making process whereby LIF Steering Committee should be further empowered to prepare and approve the final list of projects for funding.** This recommendation is made in light of the fact that EC (Donor) is a full member of the steering committee. Any priorities or preferences of EC to take final decision can be shared, discussed and approved by the EC representation at the PSC level to avoid further delays and add another layer of decision making. Once the project is approved by the PSC and decision is communicated to the local communities immediately, it should not be postponed/ cancelled to avoid waste of time and resources. If any project is cancelled/postponed/stopped due to unavoidable reason, the decision-making process should be participatory, timely, open and transparent with clear and unambiguous rationale provided to all stakeholders.

Scenario 2- Centralized Model (Alternative)- If due to the process defined in the Delegation Agreement/project document, decision is made to continue with the same process whereby after following all the selection mechanisms and processes, EC will take the final decision, following are the related recommendations in such scenario **i) With the help of the steering committee, EC should devise a clear criteria & mechanism for a 'point of no return' stage for itself whereby the project cannot be cancelled/stopped/postponed due to any reason after this stage.** The criteria may include for instance, a certain stage of the project maturation, time frame, milestones and level of engagement of local communities etc. It will assist all key stakeholders including EC, UNDP and beneficiaries to bring efficiency in implementation as well as to achieve defined results and targets; **ii) While EC will take the final decision about the project to be funded, it is recommended that donor should either refrain to represent in the steering committee to allow more empowered and open deliberations at the steering committee or donor can take an 'observer's' role in the steering committee where other 3 members would remain full members iii)** Since it was observed that after all deliberations, projects are cancelled or postpone due to strategic priorities and discussion beyond the steering committee (e.g. at central government and/or EC levels etc.), it is recommended that either i) steering committee members can be included as observers in the forums where final decisions on thematic priorities are taken by the donor or stakeholders (like central government etc) or ii) stakeholders like central government can be invited in the steering committee as guests whenever or wherever required. It will bring both transparency as well as efficiency in understanding and rationalizing the final decision on projects to be funded.

Stakeholder Engagement, Visibility & Sustainability-Based on the findings of the data collection phase, it is recommended that clear and concise communication and engagement strategy should be devised and implemented,

primarily for the local communities waiting for the project selection decisions whereby, beneficiaries are regularly informed about the status of their application and related decisions. This is vital to rebuild the trust.

- ❖ It is vital for the project to enhance its visibility through public outreach as well as multiple communication channels to promote the success stories of the project like Covid-19 response project as well as ongoing projects, for instance through video documentaries etc.

- ❖ A clear, coherent, and comprehensive sustainability/exit strategy should be developed covering political, socio economic, institutional and financial components of the project sustainability.

- ❖ UNDP should also complement the sustainability plan by a well-planned and 'resource mobilization strategy'.

- ❖ UNDP should also strengthen its capacity building programme by aligning its needs assessment criteria in line with the priorities of the local communities, link it with and thematic areas of CfPs. It is vital that any further CfPs should be backed by a comprehensive capacity needs assessment whereby the thematic areas to be determined by UNDP jointly with EC based on the priorities identified., incorporating lessons learned from earlier CfPs and develop a well-targeted training programmes for the identified local communities with limited capacities.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Cyprus joined the EU in 2004 as a de-facto divided island. On 26 April 2004, the Council of the European Union stated its determination to "put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community and to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community". Against this background, the Commission implements an aid project for the Turkish Cypriot community based on the Aid Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 389/2006). The project is managed by the Commission's Structural Reform Support Service. It is aimed to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community. Under this project, the European Commission through the UNDP Cyprus has aimed to establish a new instrument called "Local Infrastructure Facility" (LIF). The LIF project is aimed to identify, screen, mature, prepare for tender, and implement local infrastructure investments, targeting the funding on competitive basis to ensure best value for money and providing support also to those communities with a lower technical and administrative capacity.

Main targeted areas of the project include:

- ❖ Water and wastewater
- ❖ Solid waste management
- ❖ Energy efficiency
- ❖ Environment/Landscaping
- ❖ Social infrastructure

With the key objective of providing technical assistance for the design and implementation of projects aiming at improving environmental, social and economic infrastructure in the Turkish Cypriot community, the project is aimed at following outputs:

- ❖ Output 1: Establishment of the Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) Unit and its governance mechanism
- ❖ Output 2: Support to local communities in the identification of infrastructure needs
- ❖ Output 3: Support to local communities in the preparation of sector specific Master Plan/s
- ❖ Output 4: Support to local communities in the preparation & implementation of selected infrastructure project designs, works, supplies and supervision

- ❖ Output 5: Increasing capacity of local administration & engineering expertise
- ❖ Output 6: Visibility & awareness raising

The purpose of this midterm evaluation was to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the ongoing project, identify the key lessons learned and recommend a way forward for the remaining years of the project. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the project planning and implementation also remained a key attribute of the evaluation.

This section will outline the overall adopted evaluation approach, methodology and data collections tools etc. that were used to conduct the mid-term evaluation of the Local Infrastructure Project (LIF).

2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES & APPROACH

2.1. Evaluation Objectives and Criteria

The mid-term evaluation of the project was aimed at addressing the following objectives and related evaluation criteria that assisted in the assessing the performance of the project since the inception of LIF project till now.

Primary Objective

To undertake a mid-term evaluation of the project outputs in terms of their: relevance; impact; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability; gender; results/outcome map; stakeholders and partnership strategy. The mid-term evaluation should also provide recommendations for any improvements that can be made for the continuation of the project.

Other Objectives

- To assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact (both intended and unintended) of the project in achieving the expected results so far
- To assess the effectiveness and coherence of the coordination mechanisms and partnerships in project implementation
- To identify what worked well and what did not and draw lessons for future programming, organization, and strategy
- To document and or harvest project outcomes and provide detailed contextual information and analysis on the thematic project areas
- To document main lessons learned, best practices and propose recommendations

The overall evaluation criteria was based on the OECD DAC criteria and aligned with the UNEG evaluation guidelines as well as UN-Independent Evaluation Office's best practices. It included assessing relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the LIF project. It will also

include assessment of the project's partnership strategy and cross cutting themes (**Annex B includes list of guiding questions for the each of these criteria**).

Keeping in view some of the attributes found in the initial desk review and while evaluating the project under the basic criteria of the midterm review, the assessment was primarily based on 3 primary parameters:

- I. How has the LIF project performed so far with reference to its results framework, related indicators and targets.
- II. How and if the project can cope with and realign with the evolving unforeseen impact caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic and/or any changing context that LIF has experienced since its inception.
- III. **Assess and describe any lessons learned, challenges faced and furnish recommendations.** Capturing key lessons learned was vital to inform any adjustments and realignment of the LIF project for the remaining years. Enquiring and documentation of lessons learned was done through multiple sources to validate the findings and observations. This included the key lessons learned that are already documented, findings and observations that were gathered through KIIs, documents review, and survey. The scope of assessment was aimed at the following basic questions:
 - ❖ How and to what extent, the key lessons learned so far have been documented and discussed?
 - ❖ What didn't go so well and what can we learn from that?
 - ❖ What should be done to improve the project planning and implementation in the remaining years of the project?

2.2. Inception Meeting/Call

Upon the award of a contract, a virtual inception meeting was held on 6th June 2022. The meeting was initiated with a brief introduction of the LIF project by the UNDP Project Manager. The overview was followed by discussions on expectations about key deliverables, and timelines. In addition, the inception meeting call served as an opportunity to discuss management approach and coordination mechanisms of the assignment and to request relevant important documents. After the meeting, UN also shared available information as well as documents pertaining to the LIF project for desk review and document analysis.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The following sections provide relevant details about the **evaluation methodology** that was agreed upon, adopted and implemented to collect data that formed the basis of this evaluation report.

PREPARATION OF THE EVALUATION

3.1. Desk Review and Document Analysis

The foundation of the desk review was the background documents shared by the UNDP team. A review of the documents such as LIF project documents, revisions and addendums, progress reports, minutes of project steering committee, documents of call for proposals etc., facilitated a basic understanding of the project and enabled an effective assessment design that formed the basis of field mission.

A basic list of documents reviewed is provided in the **Annex A**.

3.2. Programmatic Scope of the Assessment

The programmatic scope of the evaluation exercise was primarily focused on evaluating the relevance, effectiveness & impact, efficiency and sustainability of the following key outputs, indicators, and targets of the results frameworks.¹ Annex F provided the related results framework and a snapshot of progress update against each output and indicators.

3.3. Development of Assessment Tools

The TORs and the Desk Review of the documents provided an informed foundation for the development of assessment tools. Keeping in view that the primary focus of the LIF project is on community level development, a mix of data collection tools were planned and adopted to gather data from multiple sources. These tools were based on the four techniques and comprise of:

- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)
- Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS)
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
- Direct Observations/Site Visits

The above-mentioned tools were user friendly and provided a combination of qualitative and quantitative information. **Annex B** provides a detailed '**Evaluation Questions Matrix**', relevant/related data collection methods and sources for the evaluation mission. These questions also provided the guiding basis for the interviews and Focused Group Discussions (FGDs).

¹ Results frameworks are derived from the existing data collected from the project documents, addendums and progress reports.

3.4. Data Collection

While undertaking the data collection process, it was ensured that both quantitative and qualitative information was gathered through a combination of primary and secondary sources. Data collected from one source were triangulated with the other to ensure accuracy and validity. An intelligent mix of both approaches lent more quality and depth to ensure greater understanding of the project's progress, issues and challenges, lessons learned and also formed basis for future recommendations.

The assessment was carried out in a participatory manner, where feedback was gathered both from stakeholders at the beneficiaries as well as the institutional levels. During the data collection, the following tools were adopted:

3.4.1 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

To consult the relevant project stakeholders, key informant interviews were conducted. Multiple stakeholders participated in the KIIs, including UNDP project staff, donor, Union of TC Local Communities (TUCM), European Union Coordination Office (EECC), advisors, mayors and representatives of local communities (beneficiaries). The final list of key informants consulted during the assessment is provided in the **Annex D**. **Annex B** provided a list of questions that will guide the key informant interviews under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, cross cutting themes and UN's partnership strategy.

3.4.2 Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS)

To further validate the collected data as well as to accommodate stakeholders that either could not participate in the KIIs and/or those who wanted share more details and inputs after the KIIs, a Questionnaire Based Survey (QBS) was circulated to complement other data collection tools and to capture data from a range of stakeholders of the project. It assisted in both further validating and triangulating data gathered from the range of project documents, KIIs and FGDs as well as it provided further in-depth information. **Annex E** provides the basic set of questions for QBS, divided into 2 parts²: i) for UNDP project staff, ii) for partners/beneficiaries.

3.4.3 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

To assess the effectiveness of the LIF project and involvement of the targeted community, at least **2 FGDs** were initially proposed/planned. FGDs were proposed to include community members and

² A combined QBS is included as Annex E. However separate QBS was circulated for each of the 2 identified category of respondents

beneficiaries of the LIF project. It was also proposed that while conducting FGDs, a selected set of participants will be gathered to discuss issues and concerns based on a list of key themes drawn up. The beneficiaries will be selected in consultation with the UNDP team. While conducting FGDs, groups of 10-15 participants will be formed for the FGD with appropriate gender balance.

However, due to high interest of the beneficiaries to participate as well as to make process more efficient, 1 combined FGD was conducted that was attended by representatives of more than 5 local communities with appropriate gender balance. The list of the participants is provided in the Annex D.

3.4.4 Direct Observations/Site Visits

To validate the implemented and/or ongoing projects, site visits were proposed to make Direct Observations. It included visit to the project sites, observing work in progress as well as wherever possible, meet community members to assess their involvement, participation and ownership of the project. However since only 2 project sites were found whereby ongoing works could be observed and assessed, the visits were made to i) Kormakitis/Kormacit Centre for Cooperation site ii) Morphou/Güzelyurt WWTP extension site. **Annex C** provides basic observations on these two sites.

3.5. Development of Field Activity Plan

The UNDP team assisted in developing the field activity plan and field visit was conducted from 22nd June- 1st July 2022. **Annex D** provided a complete list of activities and stakeholders consulted.

3.6. Data Analysis

The process of data analysis was expected to be intensive as it was aimed to analyze both quantitative and qualitative data from broad stakeholder base, outcome, and various outputs. **Qualitative data** gathered during the course of the assessment was transcribed and categorized according to the various themes and topics explored with clear conclusions drawn. The **quantitative analysis** included percentages, comparisons, planned vs. actual quantitative targets (as per the LIF project's results framework), etc.

3.7. Presentation on the Initial Findings

Based on the initial data collected and analyzed through the data collection activities of document review, interviews, QBS and FGD, a debriefing session was virtually conducted on 1st July 2022 to present the preliminary findings and to seek inputs/feedback.

3.8. Evaluation Limitations

The information found in the set of documents furnished although assisted in basic understanding of the LIF project, however it was not optimum/adequate to gather in depth data. It was primarily due to the fact that limited number of projects were active on ground. However, this limitation was adequately addressed by the well-planned field mission with high level of interest level of stakeholders to participate in data collection. The field mission and overall evaluation was conducted in a structured manner whereby UNDP office provided timely and effective logistical support and arrangements.

4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

4.1. Relevance

Finding 1: It is worth mentioning that since the UNDP in Cyprus do not have a country level strategy such as CPD, UNDAF etc. it was not possible to draw relevance of the LIF project with UNDP strategic priorities in the country/region.

Finding 2: The relevance of LIF project with beneficiaries priorities were found in two ways: i) By design and based on the Theory of Change (TOC), the LIF project is highly aligned and relevant with the needs and priorities of the Turkish Cypriot Communities as demonstrated through stakeholder consultations. ii) In practice though, the relevance of LIF project is found to be comparatively reduced over the time span of the LIF project, primarily due to a gradual shift from the 'bottom-up approach' towards a 'top-down approach'. After the first call for proposal (CfP) whereby thematic areas were very much aligned with the priorities of the beneficiaries/local communities, there was a consensus found in consultations with the beneficiaries that due to restrictions on the thematic areas to be funded by the LIF project, combined with the sudden hiatus in some projects and slow progress of project awards, beneficiaries feel that LIF project's relevance to target the needs and priorities of Turkish Cypriot communities has been found as limited in recent times. It was also indicated that 'top-down' relevance of the projects to be funded with donor's priorities is now given preference.

Finding 3: In absence of a CPD and UNDAF, it was found during the stakeholder consultations at all levels that high priority projects for funding under LIF should be relevant to the EU's strategic priorities and yearly programming. While the thematic areas mentioned in the CfPs put some light to their relevance to the EU priorities, no explicit linkages of LIF project with the relevant strategies priorities of the EU's Aid Program were clearly found in stakeholder consultations in general. Without such explicitly mentioned, documents and communicated relevance to stakeholders, the relevance of LIF project could not be fully assessed in this regard.

4.2. Effectiveness

Overall Finding: Based on the data gathered through desk review and the stakeholder consultations, the findings suggest that overall progress of the LIF project against the projects results' framework and related indicators is limited and adversely affected by considerable delays (both due to various factors that led to the implementation inefficiencies as well as limitations caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic).

However, it is worth mentioning that the overall progress of the LIF project varies from one output to the other output whereby limited to considerable progress is found on output 1, 2 & 5. However, progress under key outputs of 3, 4 and 6 are found limited, affected by various delays and sometimes a complete hiatus. It is also worth mentioning that although press releases and social media updates were validated through data collected, the overall visibility of LIF project was found as limited due to underachieved progress and limited milestones to project. The snapshot of progress under each output and related indicators and targets are provided in the **Annex F**.

Finding 1: Keeping in view the 2 main sources of the approved projects that are i) projects listed in the project document ii) projects selected through the CfPs, it was found that none of the projects is completed after more than 3 years of LIF implementation so far. The consensus found in the stakeholder consultations and the 0% completion rate manifests an ineffective and underachieved progress of LIF project so far.

- i) Further, and since the inception of LIF project in 2018, 10 projects were listed in the project document. Not more than 7 projects were started with very limited to some progress. It is worth mentioning that out of 4 active projects, works on only one of these projects (Morphou/Güzelyurt WWTP extension project) is on-going whereas three other projects are at different stages of designs, clearance etc. and some of them are affected by severe delays. In nutshell, out of the 10 projects, 4 are active, 5 have been cancelled and 1 project is put on hold
- ii) Similarly, out of all the proposals received in 3 completed CfPs, 8 projects were approved for funding. 2 projects were pre-selected directly by the donor during their programmatic exercise. 3 projects have been cancelled by the donor. Only one project has actual works under progress on ground.

Data collected through the stakeholder consultations and desk review indicated **multiple contributing factors** behind this underachieved progress of the project so far.

- ❖ There is a general agreement among the beneficiaries I) There is a general agreement among the beneficiaries that overall selection and approval criteria was clearly communicated, however the final decision and rationale to accept or reject a project (by the donor) as well related mechanisms are unclear, inconsistent, lengthy and inefficient whereby they receive limited to no

feedback on the final decisions even after a year or more. . Moreover, it was ironic that some of the projects that are approved and under progress at certain level are being suddenly stopped/ cancelled by the donor due to various reasons that are not sometimes explained in adequate, timely and transparent manner, resulting in waste of time and resources e.g. Vatyli/Vadili Child Wellbeing Village Project, Risokarpaso/Dipkarpaz Children Day Care and Women Handicraft Centre, Composting & source separated packaging waste recycling facility - 'Ekopark' etc. (All of these projects have a start date of year 2020 and they were cancelled/stopped in 2021/22). One of the stakeholders critically highlighted this sudden change in decisions as **'don't change the rules during the match'**

- ❖ It was also highlighted that projects have seen considerable delays due to particular clause in the aid agreement, its interpretation as well as the related mechanism to resolve the issue. For instance, aid regulation states about respecting property rights of private individuals. The interpretation of this clause is that any project that will impact a private person's property, project shall not be implemented. It was argued that procedure of obtaining information whether the property on which a project will be designed /implemented is lengthy and sometimes non-productive. It has caused considerable delays in projects
- ❖ It was also found that Covid-19 Pandemic has caused immense and adverse impact on the smooth implementation of the LIF project as it reduced physical interaction among stakeholders, therefore causing some delays. It is due to a sudden shift from in person to online and virtual consultations, combined with the lockdown and restrictions that has affected the various stages of the projects implementation such as feasibility, design and sustainability studies as well as the actual works on ground. Nevertheless, it was also a consensus-based finding among the stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries (those local communities with the approved/in progress projects) that UNDP's LIF project team was very efficient and engaging during the lockdowns and pandemic induced restrictions. However, it was also mentioned that those local communities waiting for the feedback on decisions regarding their proposals observed even further diminishing engagement from the UNDP and other partners.
- ❖ **Limited Capacity of the local communities-** As it was indicated that the project selection and approval process and mechanisms were found very slow and inefficient, it was also mentioned by certain stakeholders that one of the key contributing factor behind the delays and sometimes cancellation of the projects at the later stage **is limited capacities of certain local communities to develop the proposal and/or to ensure the relevant implementation model and sustainability studies etc.** It was also highlighted that certain proposals are not implemented as they were not based on a coherent sectoral approach by the local communities, e.g. for the Solid Waste Management. It was also highlighted during the stakeholder consultations that local communities have heavily relied on external consultations for the development and submission

of proposals. However, the subsequent assessments by the LIF project's steering committee and advisory board indicated that there are considerable issues of resources, expertise and capacities in the local communities to fine-tune the proposals, fulfilling the pre-requisites and implement the projects. Nevertheless, this observation was strongly countered by certain local communities and stakeholders whereby they highlighted that while local communities are not directly responsible for the maturation of projects, their projects were either even stopped or cancelled after 1-2 years of engagement, arguably without giving limited capacities as core reason behind such decisions.

- ❖ **Limited market supply with restrictions-** From the procurement view, it was also found that limited market supply of vendors with optimum expertise and resources, combined with a series of market restriction has also sometimes contributed to slow progress of implementation, particularly where the projects have reached at the later stages of implementation. However, based on the site visits and consultations with beneficiaries on ground, the finding, particularly related to the construction and ongoing works was countered by the fact that **they were satisfied with the project progress on ground, the contractors as well as the time efficiency.**
- ❖ **Finding 2:** During the stakeholder consultations, there was a **clear and strong mistrust found between most of the beneficiaries (Local communities), particularly those waiting for the approval/rejection decisions and key implementation partners/donor including UNDP LIF and EU.** Limited and inconsistent communication with those local communities with pending decisions on projects, sudden change in strategic priorities, visibility and engagement, particularly with reference to the status of approval and related decisions were found as the fundamental reasons. This poses a serious threat to the LIF's medium to long term sustainability and effectiveness.

Moreover, this poses another challenge for the LIF project **beneficiaries are gradually losing their interests and motivation to actively engage** as well as value the LIF project. It is evident from the diminishing number of both local communities involved, and number of applications submitted in CfPs (**23 Local communities with 63 applications** in 2019 to **8 local communities with 6 applications in 2021**). The stakeholder consultations further validated this finding.

- ❖ **Finding 3:** It was also found that by design, the LIF project through its partners has immense potential to implement a complex project, subject to optimum coordination, decision making and communication mechanisms. The successful completion of Covid-19 response project was found as **a fundamental example to demonstrate strong responsiveness, flexibility and adaptability** of LIF project as well as the potential of the stakeholders effective and efficient implementation competencies if well-coordinated and engaged efforts are made. There was a clear consensus found that UNDP as a lead implementation agency along its partners has achieved remarkable success in the Covid-19 response project and highly appreciated by the stakeholders consulted.

- ❖ **Finding 4:** While capacity building of local communities is an integral component of the LIF project, it was found that i) the existing capacity issues of the local communities to develop and implement infrastructure projects is a problem as well as ii) LIF's capacity building activities to build the capacities and iii) local communities interest in such capacity building activities has seen diminishing/declining trend over the period of the project lifecycle. Although UNDP has engaged with several capacity building initiatives in the early stages of the LIF project (valued and appreciated by the stakeholders consulted), the decreasing motivation and interest of beneficiaries in the project due to mistrust found as key hurdle for UNDP to sustain its training programs. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the beneficiaries are involved during the maturation phase and transfer of knowledge is occurring during this stage
- ❖ **Finding 5: The projects costing criteria does not cater to the unavoidable risk of increasing prices, costs and retaining resources** due to the delays caused by the factors beyond the control of beneficiaries such as decision-making delays from UNDP/EC/Steering Committee, pandemic and international/national economics dynamics. This lack of provision for the contingency budgetary support as well as donor's inflexibility to update/change initial budget estimates further enhances the risk of implementation even after the project is approved and goes into implementation. This missing attribute was unanimously highlighted by the relevant stakeholders consulted.
- ❖ **Finding 6:** More importantly and with relevance to its design, the overall results framework of the LIF project, particularly for output 3 & 4 are found as over ambitious since its inception, considering LIF as a community-based infrastructure projects. For instance, keeping in view the selection and approval processes, completion of 5 infrastructure projects by year 3 was assessed as an over ambitious target.

4.3. Efficiency

Key Finding- The overall implementation efficiency of the LIF project, particularly in terms of output delivery is found as inefficient in general, particularly due to sometimes unclear, long and stringent governance, project approval and implementation mechanisms

4.3.1. Implementation Arrangements and Output's Efficiency

Overall project implementation mechanism is based on multi layered mechanism. It includes:

- i) **LIF Steering Committee:** Comprises of representatives from EU, UNDP, UTCM and EUCC as full members. It is responsible for making, on a consensus basis, management recommendations for the Project. Particularly, the LIF Steering Committee has the responsibility to review and endorse Project documents and revisions thereto, annual work plans, quarterly and annual project reports.

ii) **Advisory Board:** composed of representatives of the EU (EUPSO relevant staff), EUCC, UTCM and other various relevant local technical departments (e.g. environment, town planning, etc.), local communities and associations such as professional associations, technical chambers, civil society organisations, etc.. It is responsible for providing technical advice and recommendations to the LIF steering committee, LIF Team on technical aspects of the different projects. The Advisory Board also act as liaison between UNDP and the local communities.

iii) **UNDP LIF Unit:** It is responsible for the day-to-day oversee and implementation of the programme as described above.

❖ **Finding 1:** Due to the nature of the Delegation Agreement and as indicated in the project document whereby the donor (EU) is the final authority of taking a decision on project approval, the role of Project Steering Committee is found as limited and less empowered. Apparently, it was a bit unclear and may lead to duplication of efforts that since EU has representation at the steering committee as a full member, why the EU's view and/or decision on the project selection cannot be discussed and/or communicated through the EU representation at the steering committee (despite representatives from different EU department represents at different forums). It was found during stakeholder consultations that after all the lengthy process of project screening, fine-tuning, assessments to the final recommendations (with EU's representation at all levels), any recommended project can be vetoed by the donor after it goes through the steering committee

❖ **Finding 2:** A general consensus was found among the most stakeholders of the LIF project that the mechanism and criteria of final approval and selection of project as well as to change the scope, decision and status of project from approved to freeze/cancelled **is not found as always transparent, clear and understandable, particularly for beneficiaries.** This has led to considerably adverse impact on LIF project as well as UNDP LIF/EC credibility and level of trust with the beneficiaries.

❖ **Finding 3:** Coordination, communication, and visibility components of the project, particularly with reference to the beneficiaries are found as both **stronger links in case of approved and under progress projects as well the weaker links at multiple levels that includes UNDP to Beneficiaries with awaiting decisions on projects as well as UNDP to Steering Committee etc.** This was found as adversely affecting the project implementation efficiency.

i) Stakeholder consultations highlighted that once the projects are approved and at any stage of implementation, UNDP has been found as actively engaged and communicating with the beneficiaries. The site visits and consultation with community representatives on ground confirmed this finding.

- ii) However, for all other levels as indicated, UNDP's communication and coordination mechanism and progress were not highly rated by the stakeholders consulted. It was also highlighted that submission of documents, particularly for the LIF steering committee also needs to further improve in terms of both time efficiency as well as the quality and depth of the content. Moreover, it was also indicated that UNDP although being a bridge between the PSC, donor and beneficiaries, takes considerable time to facilitate flow of information and communication between donor/PSC decisions to beneficiaries and vice versa. However, as a counter argument, it was also found that the delay in communication of decisions about project approval as well as lack of any communicated adequate rationale behind a sudden cancellation or hiatus of a project from the donor are major reasons behind delayed information sharing with stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries
- iii) **The overall visibility of the LIF project was found as very limited**, particularly in case of projecting the success story of Covid-19 programme and the on-going projects on ground. Apart from website and a Facebook presence, no clear evidence on continued videos, press releases, documentaries (as guided by Output 6) were adequately found

❖ **Finding 4: Output Efficiency-** Hindered by the significant delays caused by implementation inefficiencies and Covid-19 Pandemic and ever-changing, mainly ambiguously and abruptly communicated strategic priorities of the donor as indicated above, the output efficiency is found as limited. **(Progress update on each output is provided in Annex F).**

4.3.2. Monitoring and Evaluation

Following are some of the key findings on the M&E function of the programme:

Finding 1: Annual Reports included results based reporting and continued monitoring of project progress as the **stronger attributes** of the programme's M&E mechanism. No issues regarding annual reports were highlighted during the stakeholder consultations.

Finding 2: Apart from the annual reports, it was highlighted that timing and content of UNDP's submission of periodic status reports and information status updates etc. to the Steering Committee, partners and beneficiaries need considerable improvement in terms of time efficiency as well as the quality and depth of the content.

4.3.3. Allocated Budget vs. Actual Expenditure

Finding: The planned vs. actual (revised) expenditure of the LIF project was found as efficient in terms of its delivery rate (2019-2021) that stood at approximately 85%.

Following is the snapshot of the year wise expenditure pattern:

| Output | Total Planned Budget (In USD) | Revision (In USD) | Total Actual expenditure (In USD) |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Year 1 2019 | 2,966,868 | 650,760 | 507,147 |
| Year 2 2020 | 4,281,908 | 5,174,468 | 4,381,325 |
| Year 3 2021 | 6,175,040 | 1,526,975 | 1,377,397 |
| Total | 13,423,816 | 7,352,203 | 6,265,870 |

4.3.4. UNDP's Partnership Strategy

Key Finding- The composition of partners involved in LIF project is found to be a **strong attribute of the project** as it includes representation from all major stakeholders. However, the coordination, engagement as well as trust building measures through consistent communication, particularly with reference to the status of the projects **were found as underachieved and needs to be improved.**

In its efforts to engage stakeholders to foster greater cooperation between them and form partnerships to leverage support, the Project extended membership to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to EUCC and UTCM, which was initially only reserved for UNDP and EU/EUPSO. With the establishment of Advisory Boards (AB) in 2020, UNDP played a key role in information sharing between the PSC and AB members while also administering AB meetings. Moreover, despite not being planned in the DoA, the EU and UNDP decided to hold regular coordination meetings to exchange information about progress, issues and actions to be taken by both parties which resulted in enhanced coordination among two key stakeholders.

On the contrary, limited engagement and lack of trust between Project Implementation team/donor and key external partners (Local communities), particularly with those waiting for decisions on their applications, was reported during stakeholder consultations owing to the delays in decisions regarding projects. For instance, it was reported that this lack of coordination was also reflected through the postponement of certain project activities, i.e. development of Regional Master Plan for Wastewater, Water Resources and Flood Plains, which was identified as a priority area during stakeholder consultations. Initially, a series of meetings were organized with external partners to present the purpose of the assignment and to collect information. However, EUCC requested for a one-year postponement of the Master Plan preparation until at least October 2020. Consequently, there has been no further progress hitherto and the Project has not received any feedback from the partners on whether or not it will be implemented in the close future.

4.4. Impact

Since no projects approved through CfPs or listed in project document are completed, it is difficult to assess the overall impact of the LIF project on Turkish Cypriot Communities. Nevertheless, the impact of LIF project's support during Covid-19 pandemic, particularly with reference to procurement of testing kits, PPEs, setting up laboratories and equipment has been found as significantly contributing to the national Covid-19 response. The positive impact of this support was also acknowledged by the stakeholders.

4.5 Sustainability

Finding 1- At macro level and in a consolidated and structured form, there is no practical, clear or coherent sustainability and exit strategy found at LIF project level, both in the project document as well in any other documents on how this sustainability mechanism will work, what are the risks and how these risks will be mitigated. A consolidated, comprehensive and process-oriented sustainability strategy is vital for community-based infrastructure projects funding facility

Finding 2- However at micro level and at individual community-based project level, it has intrinsic design-based sustainability attributes whereby the projects funded under LIF are aimed at strengthening capacities and ensure local ownership. It is also ensured that sustainability plans for every approved project is effectively developed to assess and maintain sustainability of the projects. Nevertheless, the financial, human and logistical resources-based sustainability of the projects in terms of its ownership by the local communities are found as big challenges for the LIF project.

Finding 3- Despite a complex political context in the region as main challenge of socio-political sustainability, it is more importantly **the loss in credibility of LIF project, trust and motivation from local communities/beneficiaries** that are in reality, posing a serious sustainability threat to the project.

4.5. Gender Equality, Empowerment & Youth

Key Finding- Although it is difficult to measure the impact of the project for women and other vulnerable groups as beneficiaries due to no results on ground, the inclusion of women, gender and youth balance in composition of the advisory boards, representation in local communities were found as stronger attributes of the project. Nevertheless, a baseline and targets for women and other vulnerable groups from projects implementation should be clearly developed and projects in the reports.

Specifically, Output 5 pertained to the capacity development of local administration which included components of Gender Equality, Empowerment, & Youth to be achieved through on-the-job trainings, Gender Analysis, and improved women's participatory and decision-making skills in community infrastructure management issue. While the Project has exceeded its target with regards to on-the-job trainings with 35 trainings conducted till thus far with all local communities across the northern part of Cyprus, it has not been successful in undertaking a gender analysis so far mainly owing to the delays caused by Covid-19. Lastly, since no baseline or targets were set for improved women's participation, the Project is measuring progress towards this indicator by recording the percentage of women participating in the Project training programmes. Data from the Annual Progress Reports show that women participants make up half of the training participants.

However, as per the findings of the Capacity Needs Assessment undertaken to identify training requirements for local community members local communities do not have a general policy towards gender mainstreaming and provision of equal opportunities for women. Very few of them attribute importance to employment of women and their promotion to managerial positions. It was though found that a gender assessment report on the capacities of local authorities, gender action plan and training programme will be completed until the end of 2022.

Hence, while women participants reportedly felt empowered after the training and due to equal representation, it is imperative to consider gender sensitive targets during Project design and deepen the gender aspects of the project during its implementation phase.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

Based on the data assessment through desk review and stakeholder consultations, following is the summary of key lessons learned for the overall project:

- ❖ **A less ambitious, more 'do able' results framework** with effective risk identification and mitigation strategy at the inception stage are vital to maintain results-based delivery and efficient implementation. This is more relevant in a complex scenario under which the LIF project operates that involves i) A number of thematic areas ii) community-based infrastructure-based projects that involves local communities with **heterogeneous** priorities and capacities. This demands a more precise, prioritized and manageable results and indicators
- ❖ Community based projects **continued and enhanced interaction/engagement** with the community (local communities) to keep their interest, trust and motivation sustained.
- ❖ A community-based infrastructure project demands a **'bottom up' approach**, hence targeted thematic areas require prioritization as per the community needs. However, if a 'top-down' approach is unavoidable due to any reason, it is important to communicate the rationale behind the shift/approach in a way that is easily and convincingly absorbed by the beneficiaries as well as other partners, particularly the implementation agencies. Otherwise, it could have immense adverse impact on project efficiency.
- ❖ The decision-making process for selection, approval and implementation of projects, particularly with direct involvement of communities in preparation of proposals demands an **open, timely and transparent mechanism** to maintain beneficiaries trust and project credibility.
- ❖ The complete project proposal cycle with **clear, efficient and optimum processes** are vital for achieving timely delivery of the projects.

- ❖ The complex political context of projects like LIF demands a **less bureaucratic, flexible and a relatively decentralized governance mechanism** for efficient decision making, responsiveness and delivery.
- ❖ Identified lessons learned at earlier stage of project implementation should be agreed upon and acted upon with full letter and spirit (no progress was found on the Lessons Learned Exercise conducted at the earlier stage of LIF implementation).

6. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

In general terms, it can be concluded that LIF project was by design, relevant to the needs of Turkish Cypriot Community as manifested through relevant local communities. Nevertheless, the overall relevance was assessed as gradually diminishing due to a shift towards more 'top down' approach, primarily evident from revised and limited thematic areas for CfPs and hiatus/cancellation of certain projects. Moreover, the project's effectiveness varied from output to the other, however overall progress of the projects funded under LIF was found very limited whereby after 3 years of LIF implementation, only 2 out of all listed projects in the project document as well as approved projects through CfPs are under progress and on ground. Some of the other projects are at certain stages of maturation.

The implementation mechanism of LIF was assessed as complex, lengthy and sometimes unclear, particularly with reference to the decision-making process and rationale behind the final decisions. Moreover, the coordination and communication with the stakeholders, particularly with the beneficiaries with awaiting decisions on projects needs considerable improvement. However, the stakeholders involved in the approved and under progress projects are found satisfied with the LIF team's engagement and coordination.

Despite of the fact that sustainability of proposed infrastructure projects, capacities of the local communities and potential of their ownership etc. have been considered as fundamental pre-requisites and components to fund any project. However, it was also found that an overall and clear sustainability plan at macro level is important for LIF project to ensure effective and coherent sustainability of LIF project.

Based on the lessons learned and the key findings mentioned in the sections above, following is a set of recommendations for the LIF project going forward.

6.1. Programme Design & Coordination

- ❖ Revisit the overall scope and related Results Framework of the LIF programme at the earliest. Revised outputs with less ambitious and more realistic, indicators and targets should be

developed that can be achieved and/or can be shown progress within the remaining time period of the project.

- ❖ It is also vital that the project results and/or objective should be explicitly linked with donor's priorities outlined in the aid programme, yearly programmes as well as with UNDP's strategic plans, upcoming strategies like CPD etc. It will bring more clarity in the results-based programming and rationale behind projects' selection criteria as well as allow UNDP for effective resource mobilization strategy for LIF project in future.
- ❖ For the remaining time period of the project, clear and concise decisions on what projects will be funded by the EC as well as future of the projects under hiatus should be taken at the earliest, (within 3-4 weeks' time at the latest) and final list of projects should be developed.
- ❖ Multi-stakeholder meetings should be conducted immediately after the final decisions on projects are taken whereby relevant beneficiaries, UNDP, UTCM, EUCC and other stakeholders should participate. All decisions along with the rationale of selection and non-selection of projects under consideration, status of the projects in progress and/or under consideration as well as any consideration for future projects should be communicated to the local communities in open and transparent manner with no ambiguity.
- ❖ Any further call for proposal should be bound with:
 - ✓ Clear and well-defined criteria of selection of projects along with the thematic areas.
 - ✓ Since it is a Turkish Cypriot Community Targeted project, it is highly recommended that a 'bottom up' approach to identify thematic areas for any further call should be considered whereby local communities can identify their high priority needs and thematic area may not be restricted, and they should be widened as per the needs of the main targeted beneficiaries.
 - ✓ Specifically allocated and available budget should be assured as integral part of any CfP, and it should be clearly communicated budget to regain and ensure the motivation and incentive for the local communities to participate and apply. It includes for instance, 'x %' of the budget of the Aid Programme should be allocated to LIF's CfP. It should also be indicated that the allocated budget will be able to fund at least 'y number of' projects under the CfP with a lower & upper ceiling available for individual projects. It will clearly give assurance to the targeted beneficiaries that a certain number of projects will be selected with assured budget. Without such assurance, it will be difficult to ensure considerable and adequate level of interest and motivation from the beneficiaries.
 - ✓ If the identification of thematic areas with bottom-up approach is not possible due to unavoidable reasons such as priorities of central government, EU's strategic priorities etc., key

beneficiaries along with Steering Committee should be involved in the discussions and/or informed about such decisions from the onset, with clearly communicated rationale and reasons.

✓ Considering the delays caused by both decision making and decisions changes processes as well as unforeseen events like Price hikes in commodities and energy prices and supply chain problems in the pandemic period and the Ukraine war, a contingency budget item with a specific percentage should be included in the initial budget consideration so that beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders should not suffer due to issues that are beyond their control.

6.2. Implementation & Management

- ❖ It is highly recommended to review and revise the overall governance and implementation mechanism of the LIF project to make the processes efficient and bring the progress back on track.

Scenario 1- Decentralized Model (Recommended)

- ❖ It is strongly recommended to establish comparatively, a more decentralized decision-making process whereby LIF Steering Committee should be further empowered to prepare and approve the final list of projects for funding. This recommendation is made in light of the fact that EC (Donor) is a full member of the steering committee. Any priorities or preferences of EC to take final decision can be shared, discussed and approved by the EC representation at the steering Committee level to avoid further delays and add another layer of decision making.
- ❖ The Advisory Board should be clearer about their feedback on the proposals, related studies. Rather than 'agreeing' after engaging and subsequently assessing all processes, documents like designs, feasibility and sustainability studies etc., they should 'recommend/does not recommend' the project to the steering committee so that rationale of final decisions can be further strengthened.
- ❖ Once the project is approved by the PSC and decision is communicated to the local communities immediately, it should not be postponed/ cancelled to avoid waste of time and resources. If any project is cancelled/postponed/stopped due to unavoidable reason, the decision-making process should be participatory, timely, open and transparent with clear and unambiguous rationale provided to all stakeholders.

Scenario 2- Centralized Model (Alternative)

- ❖ If due to the process defined in the Delegation Agreement/project document, decision is made to continue with the same process whereby after following all the selection mechanisms and processes, EC will take the final decision, following are the related recommendations in such scenario:
- ✓ With the help of the steering committee, EC should **devise a clear criteria & mechanism for a 'point of no return'** stage for itself whereby the project cannot be cancelled/stopped/postponed due to any reason after this stage. The criteria may include for instance, a certain stage of the project maturation, time frame, milestones and level of engagement of local communities etc. It will assist all key stakeholders including EC, UNDP and beneficiaries to bring efficiency in implementation as well as to achieve defined results and targets.
- ✓ While EC will take the final decision about the project to be funded, it is recommended that **donor should either refrain to represent in the steering committee** to allow more empowered and open deliberations at the steering committee or **donor can take an 'observer's' role in the steering committee where other 3 members would remain full members.**
- ✓ Since it was observed that after all deliberations, projects are cancelled or postponed due to strategic priorities and discussion beyond the steering committee (e.g. at central government and/or EC levels etc.), it is recommended that either steering committee members can be included in the forum of final decisions as observers or stakeholders like central government etc. can be invited in steering committee as guests whenever or wherever required. It will bring both transparency as well as efficiency in understanding and rationalizing the final decision on projects to be funded.

6.3. Stakeholder Engagement, Visibility & Sustainability

- ❖ Based on the findings of the data collection phase, it is recommended that clear and concise communication and engagement strategy should be devised and implemented, primarily for the local communities waiting for the project selection decisions whereby, beneficiaries are regularly informed about the status of their application and related decisions. This is vital to rebuild the trust.
- ❖ It is vital for the project to enhance its visibility through public outreach as well as multiple communication channels to promote the success stories of the project like Covid-19 response project as well as ongoing projects, for instance through video documentaries etc.

- ❖ A clear, coherent, and comprehensive sustainability/exit strategy should be developed covering political, socio economic, institutional and financial components of the project sustainability.
- ❖ UNDP should also complement the sustainability plan by a well-planned and targeted 'resource mobilization strategy'.
- ❖ UNDP should also strengthen its capacity building programme by revising its needs assessment criteria for local communities, link it with the strategic priorities and thematic areas of CfPs. It is vital that any further CfPs should be backed by a comprehensive capacity needs assessment, incorporating lessons learned from earlier CfPs and develop a well-targeted training programmes for the identified local communities with limited capacities.

ANNEXES

- LIF Project Documents (along with Addendum 1, 2 & 3)
- Project Annual Narrative Report December 2018-2019
- Interim Narrative Report- July 2020-July 2021
- Progress Financial Report
- Call for proposals 1,2 & 3- Guidelines, forms and proposals
- Minutes of PSC meetings and presentations
- Annual Work Plans
- Presentation on Lessons Learned Exercise

| ANNEX B Evaluation Criteria & Questions Matrix Checklist– LIF project | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| Evaluation Criteria | Key questions specific sub-questions | Data Sources | Data collection Methods/Tools | Indicators/Success Standard |
| Relevance/design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the LIF project aligned with the community development priorities and needs of Cyprus? To what extent is the LIF project aligned with the UNDP's and EU's mandate and regional priorities? Is the project relevant for the main beneficiary? Did the project anticipate and respond to identified problems of Turkish Cypriot Community, and was the design adequate to address these problems? To what extent has the LIF project been appropriately responsive to political and socio-economic development issues and challenges of Cyprus? How well did the LIF project address the needs of the most vulnerable groups of the targeted community? | <p>UNDP project staff, EU, partners, any local departments, Beneficiaries</p> <p>Project documents, annual reports, M & E documents</p> | <p>Key informant Interviews</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>Document Review</p> <p>QBS</p> | Project's results indicators |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did LIF project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach and the inclusion of vulnerable groups and people with disability? | | | |
| | | | | |
| Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the LIF project objectives, 6 outputs and targets, as set out in the LIF project Document, project's Results Framework, and other related documents, have been achieved so far? Are some components better achieved than others? If yes, then Why? Are the LIF projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame? What are the underlying rationales and assumptions or theory that defines the relationships or chain of results that lead initiative strategies to intended outcomes? What are the assumptions, factors or risks inherent in the design that may influence whether the initiative succeeds or fail? What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the LIF project results? How effective has been the contribution of the LIF project to improving community participation in designing, planning and implementation of projects? | <p>UNDP project staff, EU, partners, any local departments, Beneficiaries</p> <p>Project documents, annual reports, M & E documents</p> | <p>Key informant Interviews</p> <p>Site visits</p> <p>FGDs with beneficiaries</p> <p>Documents review</p> <p>QBS</p> | <p>Project results framework and related performance indicators</p> <p>Number of community members benefitted</p> <p>Number of projects planned, designed and implemented</p> <p>Indicators and related targets of the results framework are met</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the LIF project objectives clearly stated and contribution to results measurable? • Did women, and marginalized groups of targeted youth directly benefit from the LIF project 's activities? If so, how, and what was the impact? • Were any changes made in the LIF project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries so far? If yes, why? • How effective was the project in adapting to the challenges faced due to the ongoing Covid-19 Pandemic? Were there any adaptive measures taken and/or any risk mitigation mechanism in place? | | | |
| | | | | |
| Efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are outputs achieved within expected cost and time so far? • Could the activities and outputs have been delivered in fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity? • Is there major cost- or time-overruns or budget revisions? • Is there a management or coordination mechanism for the partnership? • How frequently and by what means information is shared within the LIF project stakeholders? | <p>UNDP project staff, EU, partners, any local departments, Beneficiaries</p> <p>Project documents, annual reports, M & E documents</p> | <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>Documents reviews.</p> <p>QBS</p> | <p>Results Framework Indicators</p> <p>AWPs</p> <p>Planned vs. Actual Budget Allocation & utilization</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are LIF project objectives and strategies understood by staff and partners? • How many levels of decision making are involved in operational approval? • Were the LIF project inputs and benefits fairly distributed amongst different genders and communities while increasing access for the most vulnerable? What factors influenced decisions to fund certain proposed activities, and not others? • How efficient is the M&E system and to what extent did M&E mechanism provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly? • Were the risks identified in the LIF project document or process the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately • How useful was the results framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? | | | |
| Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence of long-lasting desired changes? • Has the initiative influenced policy making at different levels? • Has the project impacted the desired target actors? • To what degree the has the project contributed to the development taken place with regards the overall project objectives? | | | |

| Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How sustainable has been the contribution of the LIF project to improving environmental, social and economic infrastructure in the Turkish Cypriot community • Was LIF project sustainability strategy developed during the LIF project design? • Is the LIF project itself sustainable? (Financial, Institutional, Socio Economic and Resources etc.) • To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support? • To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the LIF project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the LIF project? • What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability? • Are there jeopardizing aspects that have not been considered or abated by the project actions? • Has ownership of the actions and impact been transferred to the corresponding stakeholders? • Do the beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the results of the project and maintain and further develop the results | <p>UNDP project staff, EU, partners, any local departments, Beneficiaries</p> <p>Project documents, annual reports, M & E documents</p> | <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>QBS</p> <p>Site visits</p> <p>Documents reviews</p> | <p>Sustainability strategy</p> <p>Resource mobilization mechanism</p> |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Cross Cutting Issues and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the LIF project? Is the gender marker data assigned to this LIF project representative of reality? To what extent has the LIF project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within the project? | <p>UNDP project staff, EU, partners, any local departments, Beneficiaries</p> <p>Project documents, annual reports, M & E documents</p> | <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>QBS</p> <p>Site visits</p> <p>Documents reviews</p> | <p>Project Indicators on gender and other vulnerable groups (if any)</p> <p>Number of women, youth and marginalized groups benefited (gender disaggregated data of beneficiaries)</p> |
| | | | | |
| UNDP Partnership Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective the UN partnership strategy and the partners are in providing added benefits for the LIF project to achieve overall outcomes and outputs To what extent have stakeholders been involved in LIF project implementation? To what extent are LIF project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the LIF project objectives? Who are the major actors and partners involved in the project and how were their roles and interests safeguarded ? | <p>UNDP project staff, EU, partners, any local departments, Beneficiaries</p> <p>Project documents, annual reports, M & E documents</p> | <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>FGDs</p> <p>QBS</p> <p>Documents reviews</p> | |

| PRELIMINARY LIF'S PROJECT SITES-SCREENING QUESTIONS | | SCORE/RATING | REMARKS |
|---|--|--------------|--|
| Location and Design of Project | Is the LIF project Site (e.g. Center for Cooperation , Extension of WWTP etc.) operating and/or works going on effectively? | Satisfactory | The site visits and consultation with community representatives etc. indicated satisfactory work in progress |
| | Will the LIF project site e.g. Center for Cooperation and the works under process deliver the state-of-the-art required facilities? | N/A | Morphu WTPP visit indicated that state of the are infrastructure development machinery is being deployed. It is not possible to further assess both sites at this point in time |
| Functionality | Will the operational/and or work in progress project site/venue deliver the intended functionalities and objectives | N/A | Based on the stage of the ongoing works, it is not possible to assess the effectiveness of functionality offered by the infrastructure, once completed |
| | Is any beneficiary already availing services and/or has local community representatives been involved in the planning and implementation of the project? | Satisfactory | Work is still in progress. But Community representation confirmed their continued involvement in the process. E.g. Advisory Board of Center for Cooperation is actively involved in the planning and implementation process in regular basis |
| <p>4: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 3: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 2 Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 1. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings N/A- Not Available</p> | | | |
| <p>Overall Assessment and Note- Both ongoing works and community involvement were found satisfactory. However the final outcomes of both infrastructure, in terms of its operations and functionality could not be assessed now.</p> | | | |

Annex D

List of Persons Interviewed/Field Visits

| Sno | Date | Name | Organization |
|-----|------------|--|---------------------------|
| 1 | 24/06/2022 | Evren Cavdir | EUCC |
| 2 | 24/06/2022 | Huseyin Herguner | EUCC |
| 3 | 24/06/2022 | Ali Caglar | UNDP |
| 4 | 27/06/2022 | Virve Vimpari | European Commission/EUPSO |
| 5 | 27/06/2022 | Marco Caniato | European Commission/EUPSO |
| 6 | 27/06/2022 | Hakan Tekguc | General Hospital |
| 7 | 27/06/2022 | Mert Inal | UNDP |
| 8 | 28/06/2022 | Mahbobulhaq Faizi | Former UNDP colleague |
| 9 | 28/06/2022 | Metin Senova | KTIMB |
| 10 | 29/06/2022 | Erhan Yengin | Morphou LC |
| 11 | 29/06/2022 | Mehmet Adahan | Head of Vadili LC |
| 12 | 29/06/2022 | Cemil Saricizmeli | Head of Mehmetcik LC |
| 13 | 29/06/2022 | Christopher Edge | former EUPSO PM |
| 14 | 29/06/2022 | Tunc Adanir | KTMMOB |
| 15 | 30/06/2022 | Merih Beydola | UTCM |
| 16 | 30/06/2022 | Alexandre Prieto | UNDP |
| 17. | 29/06/2022 | Field Visit + Meeting Community rep- Erhan Yengin Morphu WTPP | Morphu Site Visit |
| 18 | 30/06/2022 | Field Visit + Meeting Community rep- Yiannakis Moussas- Kormakitis KCC | Kormakitis KCC Site Visit |

| Date: 27th June, 2022 | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sno | Name | Municipalities | Data Collection Tool |
| 1 | Pinar Erengin | Nicosia | FGD |
| 2 | Munevver Ebedi | Lefka/Lefke | FGD |
| 3 | Oznem Ozufuklar | Dikomo/Dikmen | FGD |
| 4 | Niyazi Yurtseven | Famagusta | FGD |
| 5 | Gizem Mentis | Vatyli/Vadili | FGD |
| 6 | Aziz Kaya | Lefka/Lefke ('mayor') | FGD |
| 7 | Faik Ozkaynak | Nicosia | FGD |
| 8 | Cemal Bensef | Nicosia | FGD |
| 9 | Zeka Yilmaz | Nicosia | FGD |
| 10 | Naciye Erol | Trikomo/Iskele | FGD |
| 11 | Burcu Nesimoglu | Kyrenia | FGD |

Survey- Questionnaire- UN/Project Staff Only

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Name | Title, Department (if applicable) | Institution |
| | | |
| Category of Stakeholder a) UNDP staff b) Implementation Partners c) Beneficiaries | Email Address | City |

Introduction: The UNDP Cyprus is conducting the midterm evaluation of its ‘Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) project’

It examines UNDP’s contribution to project results to ensure organizational learning and accountability. The evaluation is carried out by an independent international evaluation specialist.

Being responsible for the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the project, you have been identified as one of the key stakeholders of the UNDP’s LIF project, and we would like to receive your feedback on your experience with UNDP-supported project. Your feedback is valuable and will be used as part of the overall analysis together with other information and data collected by the consultant. You will send the response directly to the consultant.

Please provide feedback on the questions that you find as relevant to your organization’s role in the project. Insert N/A (Not Applicable) wherever required.

1. RELEVANCE:

- ❖ To what extent is the LIF project aligned with the community development priorities and needs of Cyprus?
- ❖ Did the project anticipate and respond to identified problems of Turkish Cypriot Community, and was the design adequate to address these problems?
- ❖ To what extent has the LIF project been appropriately responsive to political and socio-economic development issues and challenges of Cyprus?
- ❖ How well did the LIF project address the needs of the most vulnerable groups of the targeted community?

- ❖ To what extent did LIF project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach and the inclusion of vulnerable groups and people with disability?

2. EFFECTIVENESS

- ❖ To what extent have the LIF project objectives, 6 outputs and targets, as set out in the LIF project Document, project's Results Framework, and other related documents, have been achieved so far?
- ❖ Are some components better achieved than others? If yes, then Why?
- ❖ How effective is the Theory of Change? What are the underlying rationales and assumptions or theory that defines the relationships or chain of results that lead initiative strategies to intended outcomes?
- ❖ How effective has been the contribution of the LIF project to improving community participation in designing, planning and implementation of projects?
- ❖ Did women, and marginalized groups of targeted youth directly benefit from the LIF project 's activities? If so, how, and what was the impact
- ❖ Were any changes made in the LIF project regarding approach, partnerships, beneficiaries so far? If yes, why?
- ❖ How effective was the project in adapting to the challenges faced due to the ongoing Covid-19 Pandemic? Were there any adaptive measures taken and/or any risk mitigation mechanism in place?

3. IMPACT

- ❖ Is there evidence of long-lasting desired changes?
- ❖ Has the initiative influenced policy making at different levels?
- ❖ Has the project impacted the desired target actors?
- ❖ To what degree the has the project contributed to the development taken place with regards the overall project objectives?

4. EFFICIENCY:

- ❖ Are outputs achieved within expected cost and time so far?
- ❖ Could the activities and outputs have been delivered in fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity?
- ❖ Is there major cost- or time-overruns or budget revisions?
- ❖ Is there a management or coordination mechanism for the partnership?
- ❖ Are LIF project objectives and strategies understood by staff?
- ❖ How efficient is the M&E system and to what extent did M&E mechanism provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- ❖ How useful was the results framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it?
- ❖ Were the risks identified in the LIF project document or process the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately

5. SUSTAINABILITY:

- ❖ How sustainable has been the contribution of the LIF project to improving environmental, social and economic infrastructure in the Turkish Cypriot community
- ❖ Was LIF project sustainability strategy developed during the LIF project design?
- ❖ Is the LIF project itself sustainable? (Financial, Institutional, Socio Economic and Resources etc.)
- ❖ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of LIF project outputs?
- ❖ What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?
- ❖ Has ownership of the actions and impact been transferred to the corresponding stakeholders?

- ❖ Do the beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the results of the project and maintain and further develop the results

6. Please list down top 3 lessons learned?

6.1 Please List down top 3 challenges that have or may hinder performance of the overall project?

6.2- Please provide 3-5 high priority recommendations for the way forward?

Survey- Questionnaire for Implementation Partners & Beneficiaries

| Name | Title, Department (if applicable) | Institution |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Category of Stakeholder b) Implementation Partners c) Beneficiaries | Email Address | City |

Introduction: The UNDP Cyprus is conducting the midterm evaluation of its ‘Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) project’

It examines UNDP’s contribution to project results to ensure organizational learning and accountability. The evaluation is carried out by an independent international evaluation specialist.

Being responsible for the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the project, you have been identified as one of the key stakeholders of the UNDP’s LIF project, and we would like to receive your feedback on your experience with UNDP-supported project. Your feedback is valuable and will be used as part of the overall analysis together with other information and data collected by the consultant. You will send the response directly to the consultant.

Please provide feedback on the questions that you find as relevant to your organization’s role in the project. Insert N/A (Not Applicable) wherever required.

A. QUESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS & BENEFICIARIES

- ❖ Under which project of LIF you participated as a partner/beneficiary?

- ❖ Could you describe the key activities in the project that you conducted and/or got benefitted from?

- ❖ Are the activities/outputs of the project relevant to the needs and priorities of your community/organization?

- ❖ Could you describe any key successes of the project activities?

- ❖ Can you provide any 1-3 key strengths of UNDP and/or LIF project?

- ❖ Can you provide any 1-3 weakness of UNDP and/or LIF project as per your experience?

- ❖ Can you highlight 1-3 key challenges/lessons learned that you as beneficiary or as implementation partners have faced during the project?

- ❖ Could you help us in identifying that how the project has brought difference in your life and or capacity? (Your situation before and after the project intervention/support) – **(Only for beneficiaries)**

- ❖ Do you have any recommendations for the way forward?

| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | OUTPUT INDICATORS | BASELINE | | TARGETS (by frequency of data collection) | | | Progress Update |
|--|--|----------|------|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | Value | Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | |
| Output 1: Establishment of the Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF) and its governance mechanism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – UNDP’s LIF Unit established and fully operational. – At least 1 PSC meeting per quarter. – At least 1 AB meeting per month. – Number of women participating in decision-making bodies – Number of joint decisions taken by AB. – % Of beneficiaries (local communities) that report better and easier communications with the relevant central level. | 0 | 2018 | 3 PSC meetings 12 AB meetings | 3 PSC meetings 12 AB meetings | 3 PSC meetings 12 AB meetings | Total 9 PSC meetings and 18 out of targeted AB meetings were conducted. No progress data found on number of women in decision making bodies as well % of beneficiaries with better communication at central level |
| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | OUTPUT INDICATORS | BASELINE | | TARGETS (by frequency of data collection) | | | Progress Update |
| | | Value | Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>Output 2:</p> <p>Support to local communities in the identification and definition of their infrastructure needs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 8 needs assessment meetings carried out with all fractions of local communities in different geographic areas. – At least 9 projects selected for future implementation. – At least 6 feasibility studies prepared. | 0 | 2018 | 2 needs assessment meetings | 2 needs assessment meetings | 3 feasibility studies prepared | <p>More than 25 consultation and needs assessment meetings conducted that re related to the 3 calls for project proposals successfully completed</p> <p>8 projects selected for future implementation and 2 feasibility studies prepared.</p> <p>Status of the selected projects is included in Annex G</p> |
| <p>Output 3:</p> <p>Support to local communities in the preparation of sector specific Master Plan/s.</p> | Indicator to be set depending on request from local communities to conduct master plan | 0 | 2018 | | | | No progress is found under this output |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | BASELINE | | TARGETS (by frequency of data collection) | | | Progress Update |

| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | | Value | Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | |
|--|--|-------|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Output 4: Support to local communities in the implementation and supervision of selected infrastructure project designs, works, supplies and supervision. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 8 Designs prepared (depending on budget availability). – At least 7 infrastructure works and/or supplies projects completed (depending on budget availability). | 0 | 2018 | | 5 designs prepared | 3 infrastructure works and/or supplies projects completed | The key output that is directly linked with the primary objective of the LIF project is predominantly underachieved so far. Although 4 designs prepared but only 1 supply project completed. The limited progress has direct impact on some of the projects related targets of output 5 & 6 |
| Output 5: Increasing capacity of local administration & engineering expertise | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 18 on-the-job training conducted in different local communities across the northern part of Cyprus. – 1 Gender analysis conducted. – Improved women’s participatory and decision-making skills in community infrastructure management issues. | 0 | 2018 | 3 on-the job training conducted 1 gender analysis conducted | 8 on-the job training conducted | 7 on-the job training conducted | The training target was overachieved as 35 trainings were conducted. However limited to no progress on other targets are found, predominantly due to the limited number of projects on ground |
| | OUTPUT INDICATORS | | BASELINE | TARGETS | | | Progress Update |

Annex F

Results Framework- Progress Update

| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | | Value | Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | |
|---|--|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| Output 6: Visibility & awareness raising | – At least 2 (1 in the beginning, 1 in the end) press releases issued for each project started/completed. | 0 | 2018 | 1 (project launch) | 5 PR (Start-Up) | 3 PR (Completion) | <i>Although it was reported that 14 press releases were issued, limited number of completed projects resulted in underachieved target of press releases on completion</i> <i>Total 28 project related updates are found so far</i> <i>No videos are produced so far</i> <i>The target was to conduct on public awareness event per project. Only 3 public events are reportedly organized so far since limited number of projects are</i> |
| | – At least 1 update per major project milestone shared on social media pages | 0 | 2018 | 24 | 24 | 24 | |
| | – At least 1 video clip for each relevant project (focusing on EU's impact in the TCc) disseminated on UNDP's (depending on external environment). | 0 | 2018 | | 1 | 3 | |
| | – At least 1 public awareness events organized per project (depending on external environment). | 0 | 2018 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | – Online versions of all the communication materials for each project prepared | | | | | | |

implemented so far.

*Overall 18 online
versions are
reportedly produced.*

Annex G

List of Projects- Status

| Sr no | Name of the Project | Included in the ProDoc (Yes/No) | Start Date | Estimated End date (if any) | Current Status (Ongoing, Cancelled or Stopped due to any issue) |
|-------|---|------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1 | COVID-19 Emergency Response (Supplies) | No | March 2020 | Oct 2020 | Completed |
| 2 | Kormakitis/Kormacit Centre for Cooperation (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | No | Sept 2019 | Oct 2022 | Ongoing (works ongoing) |
| 3 | Morphou/Güzelyurt WWTP extension (Infrastructure works – DB approach) | Yes | Oct 2019 | June 2023 | Ongoing (works ongoing) |
| 4 | ISWTF - Decommissioning of the Old WWTP (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | Yes | Nov 2019 | June 2023 | Ongoing (designs stage) |
| 5 | Composting & source separated packaging waste recycling facility - 'Ekopark' (Infrastructure works – DB approach) | Yes | Sept 2019 | | Stopped (Oct 2021) |
| 6 | Mandres/Hamitkoy Sewerage Network (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | Yes | 2020 | | Ongoing (pending property clearance) |
| 7 | Pedieos River /Kanlidere Rehabilitation project (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | Yes | Jan 2019 | | Ongoing (new designs in process) |
| 8 | North-Western Solid Waste Transfer Station (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | No | Jan 2020 | | Stopped (Oct 2021) |
| 9 | Risokarpaso/Dipkarpaz Children Day Care and Women Handicraft Centre (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | No (selected through the CfP 2019) | Jan 2020 | | Cancelled (April 2022) |
| 10 | Kouklia/Kukla Reservoir Rehabilitation Project (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | No (selected through the CfP 2019) | Jan 2020 | | Ongoing (ITB to be launched) |
| 11 | Vatyli/Vadili Child Wellbeing Village Project (Infrastructure works – DBB approach) | No (selected through the CfP 2019) | Jan 2020 | | Cancelled (April 2022) |
| 12 | Nicosia Old City Sun Shading | No (added in 2021 to | July 2021 | | Cancelled (June 2022) |

Annex G**List of Projects- Status**

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--|------------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| | | support shop owners in old city) | | | |
| 13 | Friendly energy systems in Lefka/Lefke local community | No (selected through the CfP 2020) | Jan 2021 | | Ongoing (design phase) |
| 14 | Replacing existing Wastewater Pumps with Smart Pumps for Energy Efficiency | No (selected through the CfP 2020) | Jan 2021 | | Ongoing (ITB stage) |
| 15 | COVID-19 Assistance – Phase 2 | No | Dec 2021 | | Ongoing (procurement stage) |
| | | | | | |