****

**TERMS OF REFERENCES**

**For a national consultant**

**to**

**Evaluate UNDP’s on-going project of support to the Anti-Corruption Commission**

# BACKGROUND

**Anti-Corruption Efforts in Jordan**

In 1996, Jordan established the Anti-Corruption Department (ACD) directly linked to the Director of the General Intelligence Department, in order to pursue cases of financial and administrative corruption. The ACD was staffed with highly-qualified personnel specialized in administrative and legal affairs. A number of public security officers were seconded to the ACD to carry out law enforcement duties, and a Prosecutor-General was seconded from the Judicial Institute to investigate corruption cases and refer them to the courts.

On 9 December 2003, Jordan signed the UN Convention on Anti-Corruption (UNCAC). Jordan then ratified the UNCAC on the 24th of February 2005. In the same year, King Abdullah II stepped up the fight against corruption by directing the government to form an independent commission that is to draft a law to combat corruption and stamp out favoritism, “wasta”, as another measure to speed up reform.

**The Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC):**

The establishment of the Jordan Anti- Corruption Commission, (JACC) in 2006 with its own strategy and the creation of an Anti-Corruption-Commission Law are intended to fulfill, as the King stated, a “clear strategy” to combat corruption and prosecute its perpetrators. Since its establishment, JACC has positioned itself as a beacon to combat anti-corruption by investigating high profile cases that resulted in sentencing high officials at the level of former ministers of the state. In 2010, the JACC announced that it investigated around 890 cases and have referred many of them to court.

**UNDP’s project of support (2010 – 2011):[[1]](#footnote-1)**

UNDP’s ongoing project of support to the Anti-Corruption Commission was designed in early 2009 but the actual implementation started in June-2010. The delay was due to a conscious decision by UNDP Jordan to postpone the initiation of the project until greater alignment of the project outputs to the JACC mandate and strategy and more ownership of the project by the JACC are achieved. As a result, several consultative meetings and sessions were conducted with the JACC Chairman and board members as well as relevant staff at the involved directorates. This led to redefining the outputs of the project, advisory support needed and timeline for implementation based on the JACC priorities. This was achieved through the support of UNDP’s Programme on Governance in the Arab Region (POGAR).

Despite the delay of the implementation of the project, UNDP and JACC have come a long way in terms of the relationship, ownership, alignment and overall achievements of outputs.

# SCOPE OF WORK AND OBJECTIVES

Within the context outlined above, UNDP seeks the recruitment of a national consultant to support the achievement of the following objective:

**Objective One:** conduct an evaluation of the project: ‘Support to the Anti-Corruption Commission to implement elements of the national anti-corruption strategy”

The scope of objective One should cover the following:

1. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the project including design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, identifying challenges, constraints and success factors and providing conclusions and lessons learnt.
2. An evaluation of the project management structure that would review and assess the appropriateness of the project management set-up to carry out its responsibility of implementation, monitoring, reporting and establishing partnerships. (*This is not an evaluation of individual performance and capacity but of the appropriateness of the structure and set-up in addressing the management needs of the project. This should cover as well the roles of the Project Board. Particular attention should be paid the contribution (or lack thereof) of the project management arrangements to the ownership by the national partners)*. The overarching questions of the evaluation are:
* Was the outcome and associated activities relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals, ACC mandate and UNDP mandate?
* Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
* Will the outputs and outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?

# METHODOLOGY

The consultant is expected to work on a daily basis with the JACC board members, senior staff of relevant directorates as well as staff members of the ongoing UNDP project of support and in close consultation with UNDP Jordan. Based on the objectives and scope of work outlined above, the consultant is expected to undertake the following tasks during the evaluation process:

1. Review of relevant documents including: documents on national policies related to the project area, the Project Document, narrative reports prepared by the project, and all relevant documentation related to implementation including: gap analysis, assessment reports and activity reports.
2. Conduct interviews and roundtable meetings with project stakeholders and partners.

Below is the criteria to be considered for the evaluation process and the main questions to be addressed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Main questions** |
| Project Management  | * Are the Project Management arrangements appropriate at the team level and Project Board level?
 |
| Project Design  | * To what extent did the design of the project help in achieving its own goals?
* Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the project?
* Were there clear objectives and strategy?
* Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmarks for performance?
* Was the process of project design sufficiently participatory? Was there any impact of the process?
 |
| Relevance and appropriateness  | * Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and challenges?
* Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the mandate, strategy, functions, roles, and responsibilities of the ACC as an institution and to the key actors within that institution?
* Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to UNDP mandate?
 |
| Effectiveness and efficiency | * Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
* Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently?
* How did the project deal with issues and risks?
* Were the outputs achieved in a timely manner?
* Were the resources utilized in the best way possible?
 |
| Impact and sustainability | * Will the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?
* Were the actions and results owned by the local partners and stakeholders?
* Was capacity (individuals, institution, systems) built through the actions of the project?
* What is the level of contribution of the project management arrangements to national ownership of the set objectives, results, and outputs
* Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote national ownership and sustainability of the results achieved?
 |

# DURATION OF MISSION

# This assignment will consist of 6 working days to conduct necessary meetings and finalize the evaluation report.

# OUTPUTS AND TIMEFRAME

Below are the required activities and expected outputs, based on the objectives and scope of work stated above, respective timelines/deadlines and number of working days:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output** | **timeline** |
| 1. Debriefing meeting on evaluation results with stakeholders
 | After conclusion of necessary meetings |
| 1. A first draft of the evaluation results, including findings/ recommendations that should be considered in any next phase of the project.
 | within 5 days after debriefing meeting(comments will be given within 10 working days) |
| 1. Final evaluation report: the report should include the following sections:
* Title page
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Table of contents, including list of annexes
* Executive summary
* Introduction: background and context of the programme
* Description of the project – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
* Purpose of the evaluation; key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
* Approach and methodology
* Findings; summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
* Conclusions and recommendations; lessons, generalizations, alternatives
* Annexes
 | Within 5 working days after receipt of comments on the draft report |

# QUALIFICATIONS

* Advanced university degree in public administration, law, international law, or related discipline;
* Fluency in English is required
* Full computer literacy

**General professional experience**

* Preferably 7 years of professional experience in fields relevant to public administration and democratic governance,
* Preferably 5 years of experience in international development cooperation

**Competencies**

The candidate should be able to:

* Ability to work under pressure against strict deadlines,
* Ability to think out-of-the-box,
* Ability to present complex issues persuasively and simply.
* Ability to contextualize global trends in accordance with the dynamics of the operating (working) environment.

# EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.
The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria – 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

* Technical expertise – maximum points: 15
* Relevant professional experience – maximum points: 20
* Knowledge and experience in international development – max points: 10
* Previous working experience on similar assignments – max points: 25

Financial Criteria – 30% of total evaluation – maximum 30 points.

1. UNDP had assisted the Anti-Corruption Department and supported the transition towards establishing the Anti-Corruption Commission in 2005/2006. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)